of the
PACIFIC
LIBRARY

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

January — March 1961

LONDON
S·P·C·K
1961

Published by S.P.C.K.
Holy Trinity Church, Marylebone Road, London, N.W.1

Printed in Great Britain by
The Talbot Press (S.P.C.K.), Saffron Walden, Essex

CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

The Rev. Leonard Hodgson, D.D.
The Very Rev. E. S. Abbott, Dean of Westminster
The Rt Rev. R. C. Mortimer, Bishop of Exeter.
The Rev. Canon Charles Smyth.

EDITOR

The Rt Rev. and Rt Hon. J. W. C. Wand, K.C.V.O., D.D.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

EZEKIEL IN THE NEW TESTAMENT — *Cameron Mackay*

THE TEMPTATION IN THE WILDERNESS — *Eric Graham*

THE PAPACY AND THE DIOCESE OF ST DAVID'S, 1305-1417 (cont.) — *William Greenway*

THE EUCHARIST AND THE REMISSION OF SINS — *J. G. Davies*

THE BREAD OF THE EUCHARIST — *C. E. Pocknee*

LECTURERS AND LECTURESHIPS IN TUDOR LONDON — *H. Gareth Owen*

RELIGION AND SCIENCE: A PHILOSOPHER'S APPROACH — *I. T. Ramsey*

RELIGION AND THE ROYAL SOCIETY — *W. R. Matthews*

CORRESPONDENCE

REVIEWS

A detailed list of books and reviewers appears on the following pages.

REVIEWS

H. J. WOTHERSPOON and J. M. KIRKPATRICK: *A Manual of Church Doctrine according to the Church of Scotland.* By E. L. Mascall

R. M. GRANT: *Gnosticism and Early Christianity.* By H. E. W. Turner

HIRAM PERI (PFLAUM): *Der Religionsdisput der Barlaam-Legende, ein Motiv abendländischer Dichtung.* By H. E. W. Turner

NIGEL ABERCROMBIE: *The Life and Work of Edmund Bishop.* By Bernard Wigan

PETER F. ANSON: *Fashions in Church Furnishings, 1840-1940.* By Marcus Donovan

PETER HAMMOND: *Liturgy and Architecture.* By G. W. O. Addleshaw

S. C. CARPENTER: *Church and People, 1789-1889.* By G. W. O. Addleshaw

JOHN WILD: *Human Freedom and Social Order: An Essay in Christian Philosophy.* By Maurice B. Reckitt

M. D. R. WILLINK: *The Gospel of St Matthew;* E. G. LOOSLEY: *The Gospel of St Luke.* By Frank A. F. Poulden

C. F. ALLEN (ed.): *Buddha's Words of Wisdom;* D. T. SUZUKI: *Mysticism, Christian and Buddhist;* ROBERT LINSSEN: *Living Zen.* By David M. Paton

S. RADHAKRISHNAN (ed.): *The Brahma Sutra. The Philosophy of the Spiritual Life.* By Noel Hall

G. D. YARNOLD: *The Spiritual Crisis of the Scientific Age;* T. R. MILES: *Religion and the Scientific Outlook.* By Charles Davey

JAMES BLANTON WHAREY (ed.): *John Bunyan: The Pilgrim's Progress from this World to That which is to Come.* By Charles Smyth

WILLIAM ROBINSON: *What Churches of Christ Stand For;* WILLIAM ROBINSON: *The Administration of the Lord's Supper;* A. G. MATTHEWS: *Introduction to Calamy Revised.* By Kenneth N. Ross

EDITH DEEN: *All the Women of the Bible.* By G. J. Inglis

WILLIAM JAMES BROWN: *The Life of Rowland Taylor.*
By H. G. G. Herklots

LESLIE F. CHURCH: *Knight of the Burning Heart*: W. E. SANGSTER: *Give God a Chance;* H. EMERSON FOSDICK: *The Manhood of the Master;* EDWARD ROGERS: *A Christian Commentary on Communism.*
By George M. Bosworth

JOSEF A. JUNGMANN, S.J.: *The Early Liturgy;* PETER HINCHLIFF: *The South African Liturgy.* By Gilbert Cope

E. C. WHITAKER: *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy.*
By Gilbert Cope

RONALD A. MARCHANT: *The Puritans and the Church Courts in the Diocese of York: 1560-1642.* By T. M. Parker

C. H. LAWRENCE: *St Edmund of Abingdon.* By G. R. Potter

F. J. TSCHAN (tr.): *Adam of Bremen.* By G. R. Potter

ROBERTO BRENTANO: *York Metropolitan Jurisdiction and Papal Judges Delegate (1279-1296).* By M. Deanesly

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

Mr CAMERON MACKAY is a former journalist and was until 1957 librarian of the *Glasgow Herald*.

The Right Reverend ERIC GRAHAM, D.D., was Bishop of Brechin until 1959.

Mr WILLIAM GREENWAY is Tutor in History in the University College of Swansea.

The Reverend J. G. DAVIES, D.D., is Edward Cadbury Professor and Head of the Department of Theology in the University of Birmingham.

The Reverend C. E. POCKNEE is Vicar of Holy Trinity, Twickenham.

Mr H. GARETH OWEN, PH.D., is an Assistant in Modern History in the University of Glasgow.

The Reverend Canon I. T. RAMSEY is Nolloth Professor of the Philosophy of the Christian Religion in the University of Oxford.

The Very Reverend W. R. MATTHEWS, D.D., is Dean of St Paul's.

EDITORIAL

IF THE issues in the Bultmann controversy become clear in future to an increasing number of theological students, it will be due in large measure to the excellent discussion in John Macquarrie's latest book *The Scope of Demythologizing*.[1] Dr Macquarrie has had the advantage of private correspondence with Professor Bultmann, and he can speak with more authority than most on the clearing up of doubtful points. It must be confessed that they are many.

Some of the obscurities arise out of the failure to define terms and others out of the too exclusive association of the process known as demythologizing with the special teaching of Dr Bultmann. If (as the Oxford Dictionary states) "myth" means a "purely fictitious narrative" and mythology (as the same dictionary allows) may cover its symbolic meaning, then "demything", hateful as the word is, would be a better term for the process of getting rid of the fictitious element than "demythologizing". Further, there is no need to confine the process to the teaching of one particular scholar or group of scholars, because we have been trying to do just that for at least two generations. "Truth embodied in a tale" is a notion long familiar: in the story of Christian origins we have all been trying to find out precisely where the tale ends and the truth begins.

What then is there special about Dr Bultmann's teaching? Two things, the amount of myth he finds in the records, and the philosophy on the basis of which, in spite of it, he justifies his belief in Christianity. With the latter we are not here concerned. Existentialism is an interesting and illuminating view of man's position in the scheme of things. Its particular value in relation to Christianity is that it leads to a tremendous emphasis upon the encounter here and now between Christ and the individual soul. On any showing this must be quite fundamental to any adequate explanation of Christianity. But we doubt whether from this point of view existentialism has any greater or more lasting quality than Ritschl's teaching in the last century which enabled the Roman Catholic modernists to surrender the "facts" of primitive Christianity so long as they could hold on to their "values".

The more interesting element in Bultmann's teaching is the historical, the extent to which he is prepared to find myth or a fictitious element in the gospel story. It is well known that he

[1] S.C.M., 25s.

repudiates the position taken up by people like Tyrrell and Loisy, and that he indignantly denies the charge that he is reducing Christianity to a mere philosophy. He is a historian. But when we ask how much reliable fact he finds in the life of Christ, it is extremely difficult to get any other answer than just the Cross. It is true that he generally speaks of the crucified *and risen* Christ but it is not at all easy to see what he means by the resurrection. It is hardly likely that he would describe it as an event of the same order as the crucifixion. "We can know almost nothing of the life and personality of Jesus." Surprisingly enough this does not seem to matter, because we have something more important, the kerygma. The kerygma is the proclamation that Jesus Christ is "God's eschatological act of salvation". This proclamation was made not in any message of the historical Jesus but in the teaching of the early Church. That was the beginning of Christianity. With that proclamation the Church challenged the world and it is with the same proclamation that we are individually challenged to-day.

Dr Macquarrie is at his best in showing how this scheme of Bultmann's has been attacked from opposite sides. There are those who think the "demything" has gone too far and there are those who think it has not gone far enough. Dr Macquarrie, although so sympathetic, may be reckoned among those who think it has gone too far. But so, for the matter of that, may Bultmann himself, for both he and his nearest disciples, we are told, are seeking to extend the reach of their factual foundation. Dr Macquarrie uses the vivid picture of a motorist hurtling down a steep hill at the bottom of which is a sharp turn. Just when you think all is lost he gives a sudden wrench to his wheel and is saved.

The point at which Bultmann makes his sudden turn is his acceptance of the kerygma. But then he is in trouble with those who think he has not gone far enough. Why, they ask, stop the process of demything just there? Is the kerygma to be allowed to take the old sacrosanct place of the allegedly historical "life of Jesus"? There are those who think that Bultmann has effected precisely that substitution. Consequently by a magnificent piece of irony they dub Bultmann himself a myth-maker! We confess to a considerable amount of sympathy with their point of view. If one has found a valuable method of dealing with historical material it must surely be available for the teaching allegedly drawn from that narrative. One cannot separate the kerygma from the history as belonging to

some quite other type of mental process—unless indeed it is to be dissolved into mere philosophy, and that is a solution Bultmann is quite unwilling to contemplate. As it stands, the kerygma bears as many characteristics of "truth embodied in a tale" as the narrative itself. Of the two elements into which Bultmann resolves the kerygma, revelation and grace, revelation is the fundamental "miracle" and grace is a dramatization. (For the former cf. "The fires that rushed on Sinai down", and for the latter, "When he ascended up on high . . . he gave gifts unto men".) Neither can claim exemption from scrutiny. If we are to use the method of demything, we must use it to the end.

And use it surely we must. Having decided what the tradition says, we must decide how much of it can be accepted as real or actual; and that residuum we must express in our own terms. But this does not mean that we must go as far as Bultmann either in his former or his present mood. Still less does it mean that we need go as far as Buri, who leads the dekerygmatizers. The mistake of both appears to be a fundamental distrust of history. They suffer from a specially sharp attack of that failure of nerve which has afflicted so many philosophers of history in the present generation. It is a sympton of the "scientific" mentality that demands mathematical proof for every intellectual position. The only answer is that history does not submit itself to that kind of discipline. But it is none the worse for that. Life is not a machine: the best things it provides are not capable of exact analysis. But where mathematical certainty fails we can still have a moral certainty. That is sufficient for most of us, and is, as a matter of fact, the standard by which we normally govern our lives. If we know a good deal more about "picture-writing" in the New Testament than our fathers ever suspected, we are still able, *pace* Dr Bultmann, to trace with sufficient accuracy the lineaments of the portrait of Jesus.

That is apparently the conclusion of Dr Macquarrie who emphasizes once again his plea for a "minimal core of factuality" so that the kerygma may have "some empirical anchor".

EZEKIEL IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

CAMERON MACKAY

EZEKIEL'S place in New Testament thought presents contrasting aspects. On the one hand, his name and activities are unmentioned, neither is indirectly ascribed quotation recognized.[1] On the other hand, his influence permeates the Apocalypse; his repute as Gospel prophet set the Fathers discussing which Evangelist each face of his throne-bearers signified; and the finding still is that "much of his teaching is taken up and carried further in the New Testament", that indeed he binds old dispensation to new most closely among Old Testament writers.[2] Life-or-death responsibility for the individual, the call for regeneration of heart and spirit, "no pleasure in the death of the wicked", the covenant of forgiveness and peace, are Ezekielian doctrines which surely live.

The Apocalypse sets the New Testament countersign on the book. "There is a resemblance which can only be accounted for by an identity of subject." "The finest passages of the seer of Patmos are based, almost verbally, on the closest and most loving study of the prophet of the Babylonian exile."[3] A Bible quiz might ask which wrote, "I ate it up, and it was in my mouth sweet as honey", "the breath of life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet", "eat the flesh of the mighty, and drink the blood of the princes of the earth".[4] In particular John exploits the *principia et finem* banned to under-age Jews. Where Ezekiel visioned the throne-chariot of Jehovah with likeness of a man, his successor saw the throne of God and of the Lamb—but still the same throne, with four *zoa*, lightnings and flames of fire, spangles of eyes, crystal firmament, encircling rainbow, seven archangels, the noise of many waters, voices and a Voice, book of judgements, and one like a son of man. Where Ezekiel described a fifty-mile-square reservation in Palestine, John saw a Jerusalem over 1,300 miles high, "sun, moon, and stars forgot" in a world with no night, sea, death—yet apparently the same heavenly country in other-worldly dimension, for there persist the high mountain-stance and enclosing wall, the measuring reed, the foursquare outline, the gates of the tribes, the water of life with medicinal trees bearing monthly. And though it has no temple, there is visioned in heaven a temple associated as Ezekiel's with throne and four living creatures, twelve tribes, palm, water of life, and a

Guide to it who "shall be their shepherd" (7. 17 R.V.) (ποιμανεῖ αὐτοὺς), as the Davidic shepherd of Ezek. 34. 23.

The shepherd figure is likewise given Ezekielian background in its concatenation in Heb. 13. 20 with everlasting covenant and God of peace (cf. Ezek. 37. 24, 26); and while in its Gospel presentation direct citation may be as elusive as in the borrowings of Revelation, the parallel offered indicates dependence on our prophet. No other Old Testament writer developed the metaphor in terms so near the familiar language: "Ye feed not the sheep . . . neither have ye sought that which was lost . . . And they were scattered, because there was no shepherd: and they became meat to all the beasts . . . My sheep wandered through all the mountains . . . I myself, even I, will search for my sheep . . . They shall lie down in a good fold, and on fat pasture shall they feed . . . I myself will feed my sheep . . . I will seek that which was lost, and bring again . . . Behold, I judge between herd and herd, even the rams and the he-goats . . . And I will set up one shepherd over them . . . and none shall make them afraid . . . They shall be no more consumed with hunger . . . And ye, my sheep, are men" (34). In the Septuagint τὰ πρόβατά μου is refrain, but it does not need that echo to show Ezekiel's thought taken up: "The hireling careth not for the sheep . . . I am not sent, but unto the lost sheep . . . scattered abroad, as sheep having no shepherd . . . The wolf snatcheth them . . . I am the good shepherd . . . goeth into the mountains, and seeketh . . . to seek and to save that which was lost . . . The sheep follow him . . . and find pasture . . . this fold . . . And he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats . . . And there shall be one flock, one shepherd . . . Fear not, little flock . . . Tend τὰ πρόβατά μου . . . Feed τὰ πρόβατά μου . . . How much then is a man better than a sheep!"[5]

Other Gospel passages produce a like sense of previous encounter traceable to the prophet empowered to "speak with my words" (3. 4). Among acknowledged echoes are the "ravening wolves", the vine branch cast into the fire, the birds in the tree's shadow, the relative inflammability of green tree and dry.[6] "Die in your sins" is a phrase sponsored by Ezekiel.[7] "Hearing these words of mine, and doing them not", error exemplified in insecure building, repeats the theme of the exiles who "hear thy words, but do them not", while lounging in shade of structures unfit for storm.[8] Rebirth by water and spirit, ignorance of which doctrine brought rebuke on a

teacher of Israel, could have been deduced by him from the promise of clean water and new spirit, and the correspondence of spirit to wind from "Come from the four winds, O breath!"[9] Our Lord's "especially characteristic" utterance on humbling the exalted, exalting the humble, was previously characteristic of our prophet.[10] The equally characteristic summons, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear", has no direct precedent save in Ezekiel's commission, "He that heareth, let him hear", with, in sequel, "They have ears to hear, and hear not", so that, as in the final charge, "Feed my sheep", implication appears of mission continued.[11]

Analogies in mission do in fact evoke comment. Each was representative "son of man" set for a sign to his generation (12. 3, 6; Luke 11. 30), and each earned protest at addiction to symbolism: "Is he not a speaker of parables?" (20. 49); "Why speakest thou unto them in parables?" (Matt. 13. 10). Yet each was in full contact with contemporaries, "sat where they sat" (3. 15; Mark 2. 15), so at home in their speech as readily to use its coinage, Ezekiel making play with some fourteen current wisecracks, Jesus' words embalming perhaps twice as many popular saws.[12] And in some parallels the prophet, despite his predominant nationalism, was more son of man than of Buzi. (*a*) Indifference to Jewish scrupulosity was imposed on him (4. 12f) as on the disciples with unwashed hands. (*b*) Israel's superior attitude to the nations is repudiated in striking correspondence: "they would have hearkened" (3. 6), "they would have repented" (Matt. 11. 21); Philistines ashamed of Jews (16. 27) match Ninevites condemning them (Matt. 12. 41); "ye are a worse crowd than the nations" (5. 7, Fisch) anticipates, "but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out" (Matt. 8. 12). (*c*) Jewish arrogance has identical rebuke in judgement of Sodom as less guilty (16. 48, as which "nothing in the whole of the Bible comes so close" to Jesus' attitude[13]), and in favour to Samaria: "neither hath Samaria committed half thy sins" (16. 51) almost says, "Good Samaritan"! And if, as the measurements indicate, Ezek. 48 locates the final sanctuary at Shechem,[14] the Gospel kindliness to the aliens worshipping there comports with that choice, notably the visit to Sychar in character of Guide to living water, Messiah in rightful setting, Prophet in his own country, and world Saviour (John 4).

In Jesus' self-designation, "Son of man", we come to a title which recent study views on one hand as offering the secret of his

mission, and on another as connected with our prophet's constant appellation,[15] since its use in Daniel and Enoch succeeds, and shows dependence on, his chariot vision.[16] A majority of Gospel references are to our Lord's Advent as judge, an aspect intrinsic in the title: he judges as "One who knows our flesh because he has lived in it"; "he gave him authority to execute judgement, because he is son of man", and the Advent is under "the sign of the Son of man".[17] This connotation, as its development in Enoch shows, is tied up with Dan. 7, yet a background earlier than Belshazzar's regency is the insistent demand, "Wilt thou judge them, son of man, wilt thou judge them?", which binds together Ezekiel's indictment of Israel (20. 4; 22. 2; 23. 36). And not only "again and again this Old Testament son of man is commanded to 'judge' both Israel and its prosperous enemies", but "he forms for all future ages their conception of the final judgement".[18] In Matthew the Son of man presides over the judgement both of the twelve tribes (19. 28) in palingenesis reminiscent of Ezekiel's visions, and of the nations (25. 31ff) in a parable anticipated in Ezekiel's division of sheep from goats and again in his requirement to feed the hungry, clothe the naked,[19] while the parable's verdicts of eternal punishment or life are the prophet's "surely die" or "surely live", and his "king over them . . . one shepherd" (37. 24) reappears in "as the shepherd . . . the King". In judging his world this proemial "son of man" functions as the Danielic saints and Gospel vicegerent.

A second major reference of Son of man sayings is to the Passion, associated in the Synoptists with the Resurrection, and nothing in the usage of Daniel or Enoch hints at the Atonement. Yet here again it is "abundantly clear that it was not as the Messiah but as the Son of Man that Jesus went to His death"; "never once in any of the Synoptic parallels is the Son of Man form dropped and an 'I' form substituted as in the other groups".[20] A clue to our Lord's preference for this title over what might seem the more apposite "Servant" is his fusion of Dan. 7. 13 with Ps. 110, "the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power" as Melchizedek priest,[21] "for every high priest, being taken from among men, is appointed for men" (Heb. 5. 1). Thus "Son of man", as mankind's representative before God, is not only *archegos* but priest, supranational priest "after the power of imperishable life" (Heb. 7. 16); and under that title the text presents Jesus as priest

("came to minister", "power to forgive sins", "Lord even of the Sabbath"), sacrificial victim ("must suffer many things", "be lifted up", "his life a ransom"), and, like the prototype of his order, resurrection-priest[22] ("remember how he spake", "shall confess before the angels", "everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give you"). The symbols of the son of man's predestined course (Mark 14. 21ff) were those of the priest-king Melchizedek, bread and wine, while outside the Gospels the rare New Testament occurrences of the term bear out its priestly burden. In Heb. 2 the exaltation of the son of man predicted in Ps. 8 is seen concentrated in Jesus crowned as universal high priest. In Rev. 1. 13 where "one like a son of man" appears in robe and girdle "it is probable that Christ is represented as a priest".[23] And in the unique use of the name by a disciple the features of Ezekiel's vision—opened heavens, Glory, descent of spirit—focus the protomartyr's gaze on the Son of man in the right-hand station of Ps. 110 (Acts 7. 55f).

Only in Ezekiel's appellation is the priestly connotation previously to the fore. His accolade came from the Glory "that sitteth upon the cherubim", the chariot which replaced the ark[24] as meeting-place of God and high priest, and, as conjoined by the Voice with "Stand upon thy feet . . . I send thee", phrases which commissioned Paul (Acts 26. 16f), connotes a comparable chosen vessel, here a Zadokite priest singled out as intermediary. Of his initial obligation it has been noted that no other prophet is required to "bear the iniquity" of Israel:[25] in this symbolic act the deputy son of man is both national priest bearing in his body the people's sins and, like the scapegoat, day-for-year victim. In the temple-vision he can enter the holy place (41. 1-3) and is addressed as head of the priesthood: "Thou, son of man, shew the house . . . Thou shalt give to the priests . . . a sin-offering . . . Thou shalt cleanse the sanctuary . . . Thou shalt prepare a lamb."[26] His *sagan* rank emerges also in his wife's representing the doomed sanctuary, while he, like high priest in Holiness Code (Lev. 21. 10f), is forbidden to mourn her loss (24. 15ff). The humiliation and suffering involved in the witness of one whose name, "God strengthens", is treated as meaningful (3. 8) and emphasized as a sign (24. 24), can be seen as the price of representing "the man of thy right hand, the son of man whom thou madest strong for thyself" (Ps. 80. 17):

> He needeth me
> To be a sign for Him,—my death to stand
> A figure to my people . . . A day shall come
> When He shall give HIS Dearest to the death,
> For thee and me!

So a modern poetess makes Ezekiel's partner in the flesh speak; and a theologian notes[27] that in the Old Testament no closer approximation than this episode can be found to "he spake of the temple of his body" (John 2. 21). Study of the Gospel usage cannot afford to neglect this background with which Jesus was so unquestionably intimate and which carries such connotation of priestly suffering in the cause of Israel. This ninety-three-times-styled "son of man" who unites in himself the *munus triplex Christi* as prophet, judge, and priest-victim stands erect before heaven as prototype of the new man who under the style of "son of man", equated in Ps. 8 with lord of creation, in Ezekiel and Dan. 8. 17 with prophet, in Pss. 80 plus 110 with right-hand priest, and in Dan. 7 with the people of God, takes over the functions of king, prophet, and priest from the first ancestor.[28]

The interrelation of the shared title has challenging emphasis in collation of Ezekiel's inaugural experience with Luke's account of "Jesus himself when he began":

In the thirtieth year . . . the heavens were opened . . . and I heard a voice . . . *Ben adam* . . . and the spirit entered into me . . . lifted me up, and took me away.	The heaven was opened, and the Holy Spirit descended . . . and a voice came . . . about thirty years of age, being the son . . . of Adam . . . full of the Holy Spirit . . . was led by the Spirit.

The parallel has fourfold uniqueness. (*a*) Here only in the Old Testament the heavens are opened for revelation, a privilege setting Ezekiel with messengers of the Gospel—Nathaniel, Stephen, Peter, John. (*b*) His use of *ruach* is exceptional, "a landmark in the history of the term";[29] at no other prophet's call is the spirit mentioned, and while his fellows notably avoid claiming it—a claim evidently in disrepute through abuse—he represents himself as physically controlled by it, as Luke, outstandingly among the Evangelists, immediately does of Jesus (4. 1, 14, 18). (*c*) Luke's genealogy, in contrast with Matthew's, is associated with inaugural experience

and Adam's race. (*d*) Ezekiel's much-debated "thirtieth year" could indicate his priestly coming-of-age, or a year in a jubilee cycle dated from Josiah's discovery of the Law—or, from the weight given "this mysterious date", both in coincidence, so that thirtieth year of person and era would be involved in either passage. By this reckoning, in any case, the repatriation-vision twenty years later (40. 1) was in a fiftieth year, so that Luke 4. 18f pursues the analogy in finding Jesus' programme in a proclamation to captives of the year of liberty or fiftieth year.[30]

Study of Gospel echoes may conclude with the connection seen by old-school commentators between the herald of jubilee who "stood in the gate" (40. 3) and "I am the door" in John 10—where "shall go in and out" (from the αὐλή, "court") uses the Greek words repeatedly found in 46. 2, 8-10 of going in and out of temple court. The Man in the gateway is arguably the Guide of 8-11, who is demonstrably the Man of the chariot-throne; and no safer identification can be made than with "*the* Angel of the Lord" [31] who in other books speaks and acts as Jehovah, and in whom simple faith from earliest days has tended to see "the Son of man . . . where he was before" (John 6. 62). Without venturing on discussion of created versus uncreated messengers from heaven one may say that the chariot-spirit which seized Ezekiel was, according to 1 Pet. 1. 11, the Spirit of Christ, so that into the Guide's mouth can fittingly be put the words which Browning's *Saul* gives to David:

> It shall be
> A Face like my face that receives thee; a Man like to me,
> Thou shalt love and be loved by, for ever: a Hand like this hand
> Shall throw open the gates of new life to thee! See the Christ stand!

The indications are that the author of Revelation is not the only Ezekielian of the New Testament; and faithful reporting claims a larger share in the explanation than hitherto unsuspected bias among Gospel writers. On the focal point of the self-designation there is agreement that it must have been our Lord's usage, and this bond with Ezekiel points to further correlation. Luke's narrative suggests that at least one Evangelist was impressed by the parallel, and Acts reinforces this deduction. The inaugural

vision relating Ezekiel to Jesus, Stephen, and John also offers a link with Paul, who saw out of heaven a glory brighter than the sun with the likeness of a man ("he was seen of me also") and, prostrate on alien soil, heard in Hebrew the Chebar commands to stand and be sent; deliberate association is suggested in "Arise, and go into the city, and there it shall be told thee" (Acts 9. 6 w. 22. 10), an echo of the Septuagint of 3, 22, "Arise, and go forth into the plain, and there it shall be told thee". The apostles could have connected the two theophanies: Paul's ideal of man with unveiled face beholding the glory of the Lord till changed into the same image "even as from the Lord the Spirit" has been judged developed from Ezekiel's picture of the son of man, marred image of God, standing before the perfect image and seized by his spirit.[32] Subsequent analogy in ministry is a commonplace of comment. As watchman, "as in many other respects, Ezekiel's experience is repeated, on a higher level, in that of the apostle of the Gentiles". "It is doubtful if the Apostle quotes Ezekiel anywhere, but his line of thought entirely coincides with his. The same conceptions and in the same order" make the new-spirit oracle read "like a fragment of a Pauline epistle". "St Paul constantly thinks of Jesus as the Son of Man . . . the head of a new humanity."[33]

Such correspondence is more easily explained by postulating contact with the same reality, the chariot of humanity "going forward, forward irresistible from Eternity to Eternity",[34] than by finding in Paul a devotee of our prophet, for other possible reminiscences are scanty and vague,[35] suggesting reliance on a general stock of Ezekielian idiom. And an exponent of Ezekiel's mission is more naturally sought in the Epistle to the Hebrews than in epistles to the Gentiles. In that unique dissertation on the high priest a latent postulate is the priestly content in the son of man title. Christ as head of Melchizedek's order reigns not as son of David or Abraham but as son of man; and while the author like his confrères avoids that title, he defines his theme as the status of man in the future *oikoumene* (2. 5-9) with Jesus first named as son of man crowned with glory and honour in virtue of his priest-victim rôle, the captaincy of a saved race which by eternal counsel "behoved him". First-century students of Ezekiel perplexed by his neglect both of high priest and of atonement within the temple-house, or indeed any facility for it, were faced with a high priest who "through his own blood entered in once for all into

the sanctuary" (9. 12), bearing like the prophet the insignia of "Son of man".

Jews, we gather from Jerome with support from the Talmud and Dead Sea Scrolls, were over-addicted to study of our prophet's esoteric first and final visions; and these can readily be related to the epistle's exordium on angels as winds and flames of fire, the Son as effulgence of God's glory and image of his person on "thy throne, O God", man exalted over creation with "the works of thy hands", the heavens, underfoot, opposition fading before divine *ananke*, the son of man visited, all leading to presentation of "the apostle and high priest of our religion, Jesus" (3. 1), the apotheosis of the prototype son of man who was sent and *sagan*.

"Now of the things we are saying this is the heart: We have such a high priest . . . the house of Israel and the house of Judah" (8. 1. 8). Primarily the epistle presents Jesus as high priest for Israel, though the quoted authority, Ps. 110. 4, speaks neither of "high priest" nor Israelite order, and the deduction from Gen. 14 that the Canaanite priest was the unborn Levi's ecclesiastical superior is on a "so to speak" basis, suggestive rather than conclusive (7. 9f). In the second phase of the argument Jesus is portrayed offering life-blood in the true sanctuary and tabernacle, though Melchizedek offered no blood-sacrifice, carried no tabernacle-association, and ministered at Salem which the Septuagint, the epistle's authority, both distinguishes from Jerusalem and locates near Shechem.[36] On the true tabernacle's introduction, literally out of the blue, he is dropped from the discussion which turns now on contrast of the Mosaic with the heavenly order, this, for all its basis in an ideal above the clouds, spoken of with a particularity puzzling to commentators, being endowed with regulations for worship and a worldly sanctuary (9. 1), better sacrifices (9. 23), the very image of the good things to come (10. 1), clean water (10. 22), Mount Zion and Jerusalem (12. 22), a non-Mosaic altar (13. 10), and a city outside the camp (13. 13f). An understood prospectus for "the greater and more perfect tabernacle" is suggested, and such, with key to the above nodi, is supplied in Ezekiel's oblation with most holy and holy portions of tabernacle-type, altar of heterodox build, sanctuary at Ebal-Gerizim, and right-hand city outside the holy camp; from the epistle's viewpoint it was planned by God, not man (8. 2), and it is not manufactural, being, in its throne of heaven and miraculous stream, clean out of this world (9. 11). As the author's

argument moves from Melchizedek to the true tabernacle, the root of his confidence that the recipients must equate the non-Israelite order to the high priesthood of their ideal sanctuary can be found in the absence of high priest from the temple visioned in Melchizedek's kingdom, plus the name of the city at the right hand of the Glory, "The Lord is there" (48. 35, Alex.)—the very image of the heavenly disposition, "Sit thou at my right hand".

That discussion of the priesthood under the new covenant would involve Ezekiel is underlined by Dead Sea Scrolls.[37] That in fact the recipients had him in mind is inferable from Clement of Rome, their nearest representative, who drags the prophet into chapter 11's roll of faith by the hair of his mantle.[38] That they were expected to have him in mind appears not only in the preliminary setting and shepherd-benediction but in the reference to the new covenant's "clean water" which rounds off an argument largely dependent on the Law's use of the "water of sprinkling", "the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean" (9. 13), to purify from corpse-contact: "how much more shall the blood of Christ—the blood of sprinkling —cleanse from dead works?" (v. 14 w. 12. 24). Ezekiel had predicted, "I will sprinkle clean water upon you" (36. 25); and into his death-lustration for priests, of foremost relevance to the priestly contest with the power of death, he introduces a novel propitiation (ἱλασμὸν) of which the Lord God most remarkably says, "It shall be to them for an inheritance: I am their inheritance" (44. 28 LXX). The epistle's argument proceeds in consonance, " . . . receive the promised eternal inheritance. For where a testament is, there must of *ananke* be the death of the testator" (vv. 15f). The prophet of the wheels of destiny continues, "These shall eat . . . the sin-offerings" (v. 29), though the Law's priests would have to bring the blood of such propitiation into the holy place and burn the body outside the camp. "We have an altar", the epistle exults, "whereof they have no right to eat", basing the claim on the familiar taboo (13. 10f).

The alternative to this interpretation of "where a testament is" is a play on the Greek word, meaning either "covenant" or "testament", as impracticable in Hebrew as in English, and certain to bring the author's case into disrepute in the synagogue. Is it more conceivable that an apologist of his calibre, dealing with the death of Christ as the culmination of Hebrew history and hope, should rely on a Grecian equivoke, or on the major prophet round whom

Jewish expectation down to the present day has gathered? That the New Testament is found in Ezekiel, particularly in chapter 36, the standards of the Church confess: his chariot is the chariot of the new covenant, his temple its shrine; and when the Lord of the temple bequeaths himself as propitiation against the miasma from death-beds outside, the altar's new liberty is explicable in the epistle's terms, "Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people through his own blood, suffered without the gate" (13. 12). Calvary in the epistle stands amid a people who are, in contrast to Mosaic organization, outside the camp; and that is where it must stand in the oblation-tabernacle whose holy camp encompasses Salem while its Zion is on "common" ground (48. 15), a "beloved city" distinct from "the camp of the sanctuary" (τῶν ἁγίων, Rev. 20. 9).

In so far, then, as New Testament awareness of Ezekiel extends beyond Revelation it appears most manifest in those portions which present the Son of man to Jews—the Gospels and the Epistle to the Hebrews—which is where the influence of the seer of Israel's new life ought to be discerned. With Israel's failure to measure up to opportunity the prophet who concentrates on their land has been relegated to the periphery of Christian faith, yet both the march of history and the teaching of Rom. 11 argue Israel's day not over. No more, then, should be our prophet's, and the blending of his vaticination with the visions of Patmos suggests that he still may be trusted as seeing far and truly into the times with whose realities he was so evidently in touch.

1 Rom. 2. 24, "as it is written", suggests secondary reference to 22. 16; 36. 20. The borrowings of Revelation are not literal quotations: cf. Charles, I.C.C., I, pp. lxviii.

2 Cooke, I.C.C., p. vi; Lofthouse, *Century Bible*, p. 4.

3 Currey, *Holy Bible with Comm.* (ed. F. C. Cook, 1876), VI, p. 8; Lofthouse, p. 43.

4 Ezek. 3. 3; 37. 10; 39. 18; Rev. 10. 10; 11. 11; 19. 18.

5 Matt. 9. 36; 12. 12; 15. 24; 18. 12; 25. 32; Luke 12. 32; 19. 10; John 10; 21. 16f.

6 Ezek. 22. 27; Matt. 7. 15; Ezek. 15; John 15. 6 (κλῆμα, LXX, and only in this chap. in N.T.); Ezek. 17. 23 ("highly probable that Jesus had this passage in mind", Allen, *Interpreter's Bible*), Mark 4. 32; Ezek. 20. 47; Luke 23. 31. Partial derivation is found in "cast up a mound", 4. 2; Luke 19. 43; "brought down unto Hades", 31. 16; Luke 10. 15; "the moon shall not give her light", 32. 7, Mark 13. 24; "hallowed be thy name", 36. 23, Matt. 6. 9.

7 18. 24 (ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις), cf. 18, 3. 18, 33. 8; John 8. 24.

[8] 33. 30ff; 13. 10ff; "for the figure of the building overwhelmed by storms, Mt. 7. 27, Lk. 6. 49".—Cooke on 13. 13.

[9] 36. 25f; 37. 9; John 3. 5ff.

[10] 17. 24; 21. 26; Luke 14. 11 with *Cent. B.* note.

[11] 3. 27; 12. 2. Cf. Abbott, "*Son of Man*", pp. 104ff, Jesus' words "derive their meaning from the precedent in Ezekiel".

[12] Cooke, p. 96 (add 16. 44); *Hastings Dict. of Christ and Gospels*, s.v. "Proverbs"; Curtis, *Jesus Christ the Teacher*, pp. 91ff.

[13] Abbott, p. 97, on Matt. 10. 15; 11. 24; Luke 10. 12.

[14] *Princeton Theol. Review*, July, 1922, pp. 399ff; *Expository Times*, Aug., 1944, pp. 292ff.

[15] V. Taylor, *Names of Jesus*, p. 68; Cadoux, *Historic Mission of Jesus*, p. 99; Curtis, pp. 138 ff; Duncan, *Jesus, Son of Man*, pp. 145f; Richardson, *Introd. to Theol. of N.T.*, pp. 20, 145f ("he took it from the Book of Ezekiel").

[16] Cf. Bowman, *Expository Times*, Aug., 1948, pp. 285f.

[17] Curtis, p. 155; John 5. 27; Matt. 24. 30.

[18] Curtis, p. 140; Lofthouse, p. 3.

[19] Cooke on 34. 17; May, *Interpreter's B.*, on 20. 37; 34. 17; Currey, Note on 18.

[20] Duncan, pp. 153, 170; W. Manson, *Jesus the Messiah*, pp. 129f.

[21] "All the interpretations of the Son of Man meet us in the declaration to the priests (Mk. xiv 62) that they would see the prophecies of Psa. cx 1 and Dan. vii. 13 fulfilled." V. Taylor, p. 34. Cf. Mark 12. 36.

[22] *Church Quarterly Review*, July-Sept., 1944, pp. 175ff.

[23] Charles, *Revelation*, I, p. cxiii; Jennings, *Jewish Antiquities* (1762), i, 5, "in the form and habit of a priest"; V. Taylor, p. 115 and *Person of Christ* (1958), p. 140, "pictured as the High Priest"; Richardson (1958), p. 201, "in a priestly garb".

[24] Currey, p. 185; Lofthouse, p. 58. Cf. Exod. 25. 22; Lev. 16. 2; 1 Chron. 28. 18.

[25] Abbott, p. 92, on 4. 4ff.

[26] 43. 10, 19; 45. 18; 46. 13. See Cooke, pp. 494, 511; Rabbi Fisch, *Ezekiel*, p. 299, on prophet officiating "as High Priest".

[27] Barbara Miller, *Ezekiel*; Abbott, p. 94.

[28] Cf. Bentzen, *King and Messiah*, pp. 42ff, 64: in Ps. 8 "this 'Son of Man' is 'First Man' and 'First King' . . . the origin of the functions of king, prophet and priest".

[29] Wheeler Robinson, *Two Hebrew Prophets*, pp. 89ff. Cf. E. Jacob, *Theology of O.T.*, p. 125, "The pre-exilic prophets from Amos onwards never speak of the possession of the spirit in order to justify or authenticate their work"; *Encyc. Biblica*, 4752, pre-Ezek. only in Isa. 30. 1, Hos. 9. 7, Mic. 3. 8; I. F. Wood, *Spirit of God in Biblical Literature*, p. 45, "Ezekiel is the last prophet who expressed his emotional experience in this form."

[30] Abbott, p. 87, compares Ezekiel's mission to captives; Plummer, I.C.C. *Luke*, notes that the metaphors harmonize with "captives in exile, some of whom have been blinded". "The year of liberty" is known to Ezek. 46. 17: cf. 7. 13; Lev. 25. 10. On "thirtieth year" see Cooke, pp. 3, 6f.

[31] *Evangelical Quarterly*, Jan.—March, 1960, pp. 18f.

[32] E. Jacob, p. 81, on 2 Cor. 3. 18. Note preceding mention of Ezekielian "hearts of flesh" and of the ministrations of condemnation and righteousness —illustrated in the chariot's two reappearances.

[33] Skinner, *Expositor's Bible*, p. 301, on Acts 20. 17-35; Davidson, *Cambridge Bible*, pp. lv, 289 (cited by Skinner, p. 366; Lofthouse, p. 267; Cooke, p. 386); W. Manson, p. 158; cf. Richardson, pp. 138f.

[34] Blake, *Jerusalem*, iv, 98.

[35] "In the likeness of men", Phil. 2. 7; Ezek. 1. 26. "Whited wall", Acts 23. 3; Ezek. 13. 10ff. "When they shall say, Peace and safety", 1 Thess. 5. 3; Ezek. 13. 10, 16. "Sitteth in the sanctuary of God, setting himself forth as God", 2 Thess. 2. 4; Ezek. 28. 2. Passover consisting of feast of unleavened bread without paschal meal, 1 Cor. 5. 7f; Ezek. 45. 21-4.

[36] *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, July-Oct., 1948, pp. 121ff.

[37] Gaster, *Scriptures of Dead Sea Sect*, on "sons of Zadok", pp. 14, 308f; cf. p. 74, Zadokite Document, "even as God has sworn unto them by the hand of the prophet Ezekiel".

[38] *Ep. to Corinthians*, 17, applying to him Heb. 11. 37, "in sheepskins, in goatskins". Cf. Zech. 13. 4.

THE TEMPTATION IN THE WILDERNESS

ERIC GRAHAM

My son, if thou comest to serve the Lord,
Prepare thy soul for temptation.

So THE Son of Sirach begins his noble second chapter. Every man who tries to devote his life to the service of God is bound to be faced by temptations, not as an arbitrary test imposed from without, but because of the downward pull of our fallen human nature. So for Christians the Dominically-given prayer "Lead us not into temptation" does not ask for a tranquil life remote from the stress of spiritual warfare, but rather for deliverance from all such temptations as beset those who fail to watch and pray. We are committed to fighting: against sin, the world, and the devil, and that means temptation: we are committed to pilgrimage, and the very narrowness of the narrow way is a standing temptation to pilgrims to transfer themselves to the broader road.

There would seem to be at least two elements in temptation: first, *enticement*, when a man is allured from what is hard and noble to what is easy or pleasant or even definitely base; this comes from his own lust, as St James says—the frailty of his nature—or from the devil. The second element is the *testing* or proving of a man's allegiance to God; it is in this sense that God tested Abraham. So St Peter speaks of temptation as providing a searching test of a Christian's faith, that faith which like gold has to be tried by fire. And because he is writing to Christians, whose eyes are fixed on Christ—Christ whom not having seen, they love, and in whom, though now they see him not, yet believing, they rejoice greatly with joy unspeakable and full of glory—the great note which he strikes is precisely this note of joy and exultation, not in spite of, but because of, their experience of temptation. So, too, St James bids us count it all joy when we fall into manifold temptations.

There is no escape from temptation for the servants of God, it is an unavoidable part of our discipline here on earth; and the higher our standard of service, and the purer and deeper our devotion, the fiercer will the temptations be. We should, therefore, expect to find temptation at its sharpest when faced by him who alone could say with full meaning "Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God". *His* soul

was fully prepared for temptation; but the fourth word from the Cross gives some indication of what his sustained heroic obedience cost him: the Tempter's words, "If thou art the Son of God . . ." must have come back to him again and again. For him in the wilderness there was no human companionship; he was alone with nature and the wild beasts. Most of us depend for much of our spiritual comfort on human companionship, civilized surroundings, and the like: even a retreat has those amenities. But our Lord fought his battle without any such aids or consolations; he met temptation at its worst and strongest, and made it impossible for the devil to plead extenuating circumstances in mitigation of his utter defeat.

It is worth while to note carefully the occasion of our Lord's temptation in the wilderness. It is the immediate sequel to his Baptism, that Baptism which was an "unction from the Holy One" for his Mission; the voice from heaven and the descent of the Holy Spirit marking him out as the unique Messianic Servant and Son of God. And it is under the guidance and constraint of the Holy Spirit that he goes into the wilderness. He goes "to be tempted of the devil"; that is his clear and definite purpose. This is no unnecessary rushing into temptation; the devil had to be forced to this engagement before the saving Ministry could begin.

Our Lord has bidden us count the cost of discipleship, and count it betimes, lest having begun we prove unable to finish. It would seem that this is what he was doing in his own temptation in the wilderness: counting the cost of the rôle of the Suffering Servant; comparing it with apparently possible alternative methods which might have been suggested for the accomplishment of the Messiah's work. This direction of his course, and this counting of the cost called for immediate decision.

There are two questions connected with our Lord's sinlessness which perhaps ought to be considered here; but I am leaving them till the end. So we may proceed immediately to the three temptations themselves; following the order given in the first Gospel. Doubtless the temptations did not hold aloof until after the forty days; but it was then that the crisis came. Perhaps the devil waited for what seemed the moment of the Lord's greatest weakness to launch all his forces into the attack. And the attack itself was all the more dangerous because the enemy was invisible, and perhaps not at once recognized.

1. "If thou art the Son of God, command that these stones become bread." If you are God's Messiah and God's Son, why all this self-discipline, which may be well enough for ordinary mortals, but cannot be necessary for one so highly exalted as you are? Besides, hunger is an essential need of human nature which must be supplied if bodily life is to be maintained at all. If Jesus were to die in the wilderness, what would become of his life work? So: "if thou art the Son of God, command that these stones become bread": if the voice heard at the Baptism was the authentic voice of God, what could be simpler or more obvious for the Lord than to use the powers, thus guaranteed to be his, for the sustenance of his bodily life? The creative power of God which was at his disposal could easily turn stones into loaves; and later on there was no hesitation in his answer to the question, "Whence can a man satisfy these men with bread here in the wilderness?"

The real point—or at least one fundamental point—of the first temptation, as of the others, is that it is a temptation to disobedience, though subtly concealed. The divine will was that the Son of God should redeem man from within by a life of true brotherhood with man; sharing all human frailties or limitations yet "without sin". "It behoved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest." So as Man's Brother and High Priest he is offering to God perfect *human* obedience; not merely the obedience of a privileged person who as soon as human limitations become inconvenient, is at liberty to fall back on divine reserves in a way not open to ordinary man. It is just this use of the Divine resources which the devil suggests to him: "if thou art the Son of God . . ."; with the further suggestion that for our Lord to refuse to turn the stones into bread would be to confess a lack of faith in his Messiahship and in the experience of his Baptism.

In our Lord's reply there seems to be great emphasis on the word man; a "man shall not live by bread alone". The devil says "If thou art the Son of God"; the Lord replies, in effect, "But I am the brother of man also: I am come to live as man and obey God as man, in the ordinary ways of human life, consecrating myself for my brethren's sake. I will not make my mission of none effect by setting myself above human weakness and above the laws of nature which are the laws of God limiting and regulating the life of man. Dependence upon God is the only proper attitude for

man: it is not by virtue of bread alone that man shall live, but in reliance on the declared will of God for mankind."

Our Lord's quotation is from Deut. 8, and the context is worth attention. The A.V. chapter heading is "An Exhortation to obedience in regard to God's dealing with [Israel]". The second verse bids Israel "remember all the way which the Lord thy God hath led thee these forty years in the wilderness; that he might humble thee, to prove thee, *to know what was in thine heart: whether thou wouldst keep his commandments or no*". This is the discipline to which our Lord, as the servant of God fulfilling the vocation of Israel as a whole, voluntarily submitted himself in the forty days of his temptation—representing the forty years of Israel's testing in the wilderness. Then Deuteronomy continues: "and he humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna . . . that he might make thee know that man doth not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live." That is to say, if food is to be *miraculously* provided, it will be provided by God himself when he sees good. The manna was not given by Moses, it could not have been provided by man, however near the man in question might be to God; and the man who was God incarnate submits himself to this rule; this divine discipline which cannot be interfered with except from above.

Thus if it should be necessary to choose between starvation and disobedience to God, starvation would be the right choice; for the death of the body does not separate us from our true life, but disobedience to God does. So Adam and Eve, seeking what seemed to them a fuller life, to turn the hard stone of obedience into the satisfying bread of self-expression and wider experience, simply "fell on death". But with the second Adam the tempter had no such success. His answer is virtually this: "Obedience to God is man's first duty and his true life; bodily life will be supported if God wills it so, but in no case should man himself take steps to support it which will involve him in disobedience to God." So we find in the Sermon on the Mount "Be not anxious, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? . . . for all these things do the heathen seek after; for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first the rule and righteousness of God"—by entire obedience and devotion—"and all these things shall be added unto you". It is good for us to

remember that those maxims were spoken not by some comfortable philosopher with a good position and an assured income; but by one who knew for himself what hunger and thirst and cold and nakedness meant, and had not where to lay his head. The self-naughting which the Cross reveals so conspicuously, and which is required by our Lord of all who would come after him, appears as his own firm disposition here in this first temptation. His one great privilege and sustenance was to do the Will of him that sent him, and accomplish his work. And the end dictated the means.

Temptation reveals character; and in the light of this first temptation we see in our Lord the character of perfect, unswerving, self-disregarding love, towards God and Man; shown towards God by his wholehearted, unquestioning obedience, even unto death, and towards man by his full and voluntary sharing of our human conditions and limitations; his oneness with us as our Brother, afflicted in all our afflictions. So the life of Ministry which ended with the thirst upon the Cross, began with the hunger in the wilderness of temptation. He is altogether ours although, or rather just because, he is altogether God's.

Further, we all have to use in some way or other the things of this life; what matters is the way in which we use them. The lesson of this first temptation is that they must be *dedicated*; and that is the lesson of the whole Incarnate life. The user of them also must first be dedicated himself, or he cannot dedicate anything. Our Lord has consecrated all human things because his own human life was entirely consecrated; and all the by nature neutral things which the consecrated person touches gain a share in his consecration and become part of his self-offering. Such "things" are the raw material; and the character of the finished article depends upon that of the user. Human life is dedicated to God, only when offered to him as it is, with all its limitations except those which are imposed by sin; because human life so limited is human life as God has ordained it, and we can only offer to him that which is his. There is no need for us to try to make any change in its conditions, as though we could correct some oversight on the part of Eternal Wisdom; providing bread where he has only made stones. The only faith which can *profitably* remove mountains is a living personal faith in the living personal God; a faith living on every word which proceeds out of his mouth, and is therefore willing to accept from him, in loving trust and obedience, all the

discipline and limitations and ordinariness of human life; without complaint and without impatience. It is enough for the disciple that he be as his Master; that lowly, patient, human, divine Master, who himself learned obedience through the things which he suffered.

2. We come to the second temptation; and the devil bases this, with truly diabolical cunning, on that very affirmation of complete trust in God whereby our Lord had repelled his first assault. The scene has now shifted to the pinnacle of the Temple; and we may perhaps paraphrase the devil's approach in some such fashion as this: "Trust in God? excellent! But are you sure you really do trust him? Here you are, in his very house, your Father's house, preparing yourself to do his work, marked out as his Son. Have you then sufficient trust in him to throw yourself down from this height in the assurance that he will save and defend you? Are you so certain that he is your Father and you his Son as to rely on his intervening to protect you from harm? Surely you ought to venture thus far; after all, there is the promise in Psalm 91 'He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest haply thou dash thy foot against a stone.' Why not claim this promise if you are his Son; if the experience of your Baptism was trustworthy; if that was the authentic voice of God which you heard then; and by claiming the promise show that you really do trust him to the uttermost? You have professed to find in him all the defence you need against starvation; here is a quicker way of showing that your faith is well-founded; quicker, yet not essentially different. And if faith can remove mountains, surely it can also ensure that you shall reach the ground unharmed? And think what confidence this proving of your faith will give to all would-be servants of God! and especially to those who find difficulty in believing that he really does protect and care for every single human being!"

I would note in passing that some such exegesis as this seems preferable to the common interpretation which assumes the presence of a crowd in the Temple courts, and finds the point of the temptation in the impression which would have been made on them by our Lord's safe descent. There is no hint of any such thing either in the devil's suggestion or in our Lord's reply; and this interpretation seems to anticipate the third temptation.

Our Lord's reply is, "It is written again, 'thou shall not tempt the Lord thy God': shalt not go out of thy way to put him to the proof." For that is not the way of faith and trust; it may have the outward semblance of faith, but it lacks the reality. It is the mark of a *faithless* generation to seek a sign, of whatever sort the sign may be; and it is the mark of self-centred presumption to claim special treatment for oneself. The highest faith is not that which says, "I will trust God if and for so long as he keeps me safe from bodily harm! but that which trusts him utterly and always, regardless of whatever suffering and loss may come through the changes and chances of this mortal life, or through his own mysterious vocation to suffering. True faith and trust does not make conditions with God, as Jacob did in his guarded vow of allegiance at Bethel; it is given unconditionally and without reserve.

This is in fact the only kind of trust which is suited to human nature. The constitution of God's world is such that the sunshine and the rain descend upon all men alike; and as a rule God does not interfere with the laws of nature to save those who trust in him from grievous bodily harm or from violent death. This is all part of the discipline which life in this world is intended to provide for us. The devil's suggestion to our Lord is that he, as the Messianic Son of God—the subject of that great experience at his Baptism—should exalt himself above those limitations, and vindicate his Sonship to God thereby, and finally avoid the necessity of actually dying on the Cross. And again our Lord answers, in effect, as at the first temptation, "I will not make my mission, my vocation to a life of true human obedience, of none effect by claiming exemption from human conditions and from the laws of nature which are the laws of God limiting and regulating the life of Man": are indeed the angels of God fulfilling his word. "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God" was a precept given to *man*, and expressing man's creaturely duty towards his Maker. Nor does the Psalm verse quoted by the tempter bear the stress which he tried to put upon it. In any case the true sense of scripture is to be found not by isolating a verse from its context, but by carefully comparing scripture with scripture, as our Lord's reply indicates: "It is written *again*." Thus, in the present instance, the promises of Psalm 91 do not hold good if essential conditions—such as, notably, that stressed in our Lord's reply—are violated. After all, the promise of angelic protection is given to man *as he goes along*

ordinary human paths: "to keep thee in all thy ways"—words which the devil discreetly omits from his citation. Human life in all its ways is dear to the heart of God and kept by his power: in this faith man can go on his way rejoicing, in spite of much that looks like injustice and much more that looks like indifference on God's part, sure that underneath him are the everlasting arms.

But if man goes out of his way to *test* God's fatherly care, disregarding the conditions which his Maker has set for human life, and challenging him, as it were, to show his power and goodness by special intervention to save his creature from circumstances of his own presumptuous making—then he can no longer claim the promise; he is trying to force the hand of the Almighty; he is tempting God. It is the condemnation of Schweitzer's interpretation of our Lord's motive in going forward to crucifixion that it ascribes to him precisely that course of action which he definitely set aside at his Temptation as a suggestion of the evil one, and a breach of his duty—because of all human duty—towards God.

The context of our Lord's quotation in Deuteronomy, and many other Old Testament passages, especially the seventy-eighth psalm, show that the sin of tempting God, putting him to the proof, was the besetting sin of Israel in the wilderness. Thus at Massah "They tempted the Lord, saying, 'Is the Lord among us or not?' They tempted God in their hearts—saying 'Can God prepare a table in the wilderness?' They tempted God and provoked the Holy One of Israel: They tempted and rebelled against the most high God, and kept not his testimonies." No wonder the Deuteronomist was inspired to write "Ye shall not tempt the Lord your God"; and no wonder that lesson loomed large in our Lord's mind as he studied the book, and Israels failure in its vocation. So now, forewarned by that study, he saw at once in the apparently innocent and plausible suggestion of the devil, not an invitation to show his trust in God, as it professed to be, but rather a temptation to follow in the old bad paths of Israel in the wilderness, and tempt God by putting him presumptuously to the proof: by requiring from him some outward and miraculous exercise of his sustaining power as a demonstration of his love and goodness towards his servants. It was a temptation to walk by sight and not by faith, and so reverse what God has ordained as the necessary and salutary discipline of human life in this world. From this discipline there is in almost

very man a natural desire to escape; whether by way of physical iiracle, or demonstrative proof, or an oracle of doctrinal in-allibility, or whatever else may deliver us from that venture of aith which is yet a necessary part of our Godward obedience. To ield to this temptation is to stand convicted of a wrong scale of alues which attaches more importance to an isolated portent in ie physical order or to some statement which professes to make ie sustained labour of faith unnecessary than to the regular and nceasing vindication of God's providence, goodness, power, love, vhich the true seekers have always found and still may find day by ay in the ordinary ways of life, walked in faithfully. It is this valking by faith and not by sight which is commended to us by ur great High priest and Forerunner, who habitually chose the lower and more costly, but only sure and true method, of obedient iscipleship; the way of the Cross.

3. The third Temptation, unlike the other two, does not begin vith the words "If thou art the Son of God". Against the snares ontrived by the devil on that basis our Lord had stressed his own umanity, his own human duty of obedience to God and his laws or human life. So now the devil attacks at this point; exploiting ie laudable and generous desire to serve God and give him glory. Ie spreads before the eyes of the second Adam the dazzling vista f the kingdoms of the world; and offers him that large authority ver them which at present is Satan's own, at least *de facto*. As vith the first Adam, the Tempter does not so much misrepresent ie actual prize in view as *the importance of abiding by the divine lan for attaining it.* He offers to the Messiah precisely that which e had come into the world to win; those kingdoms of the world vhich as yet were alienated from his Father, and needed to be edeemed and brought back to him. This was the Messiah's ppointed work; how was it to be done?

Two main plans seem to have been before our Lord's mind—one eep-rooted there, and the second presenting itself for a brief ioment as a more attractive and quickly-working alternative. The ormer was the way of love; love towards God and man, mani-ested in absolute obedience to God and sacrificial service to man-ind. It was the way which we have noted already; the way of ersonal integrity and personal dedication; appealing not com-elling; a way utterly sound and true, but almost infinitely slow nd painful and costly; it was the way of the Cross. The alternative

method was that by which power in this world, where the devil rules, is habitually won and maintained: the method of force—not necessarily the sheer force of arms or of brute strength, but essentially a method of *compulsion*, whether by armies or laws or diplomacy or undue moral pressure; a method in which the practical result—the winning of adherents—is all that is thought to matter. It is impossible to suppose that the devil would have wasted his time in an endeavour to suggest to our Lord any of the cruder ways by which he might draw men to his allegiance; rather he simply dropped the subtlest of subtle hints that if Jesus were enough of a realist to exercise his unique personal qualities in a sensible and practical way, he could speedily have the world at his feet, and then present its kingdoms and their glory to his Father.

But no: the world could not have been presented to God had it been won by such methods. God's work must be done in God's way; the world's way is the devil's, just because it leaves God out of account and therefore rebels against him; says, in effect, "we will not have him to reign over us". So to win all the kingdoms of the world in this way—i.e. in any way other than that of self-dedication in entire obedience to God—would be to worship and serve the devil. That is the issue as the Lord discerns it. We are not to suppose that it came before him at once so clearly defined as it is presented in the Gospel narrative; not even we ourselves could be seriously tempted to fall down and worship the devil with our eyes open to what we were doing. The subtlety of the temptation consists precisely in this: that the devil is kept out of the picture; he conceals himself; the temptation comes to our Lord in the form of an impulse *to do a great work for God in the quickest and most comprehensive way possible;* and not only a great work, but *the very work which he had come into the world to do.* Our Lord in the strength of his prayer and fasting and study of scripture, and in reliance on the Holy Spirit, saw through the snare; saw what was really involved in the apparently brilliant suggestion; saw that it came from the father of lies, the arch-rebel against God. And he dealt with it accordingly. Unswerving in his devotion to the will and sovereignty of God, he replies with his third "It is written": "thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." No line of action which involves deviation by one hair's breadth from that principle is to be contemplated for a moment; it is of diabolical origin.

There can be no divided allegiance in spiritual things; so our Lord teaches us. We cannot serve God and Mammon, or God and Satan, or God and any principle independent of him and therefore contrary to his will. Only too often ecclesiastical authorities have failed here; trying to combine the service of the secular power or of their own temporalities or ecclesiastical politics with their service of God. They have employed even against fellow-Christians these methods of force and diplomacy which our Lord in his third temptation set aside so definitely; they have thought that the devil's weapons could be used on behalf of God; they have even failed to distinguish between God's ways and the devil's. They have not been content to serve God alone; it seemed too slow and uncertain a method of achieving results which they were sure—often quite mistakenly—were according to his will. Yet all the time they professed, and indeed believed themselves, to be serving him.

Hence this third temptation—the temptation to leave God out of account just here and there, half unintentionally and for good practical reasons, when we are planning methods by which his kingdom may be set forward—this temptation is the most dangerous, the most frequently and easily fatal to those who call themselves by the name of Christ, and especially to those who hold positions of authority in the Church, or exercise great influence by the strength of their personality, just because *it tempts us on our best side*—our zeal for the glory of God, and so often goes undetected, unless we are watching and praying and fasting like our Lord in the wilderness, and sensitive, like him, to the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

It is impossible to set forward the kingdom of God—which is a divinely-bestowed and willingly accepted quality or direction for human life—by any such method; it is impossible to force or cajole men—however much the process may be disguised, and however excellent the motives—into the glorious liberty of the children of God. If we are to serve God at all and do anything for him, it must be in his own way; that narrow way which is the only royal road, chosen by our Lord for himself and for us; the slow but sure way of entire devotion and obedience to God, and of girding ourselves with humility to serve our fellow-men.

We come back now, finally, to the two problems mentioned at the outset with regard to our Lord's sinlessness. One of them is a

question of exegesis; the other is strictly Christological. It may be well to remind ourselves in passing that though "sinlessness" is in form a negative term, its real content is positive in the highest degree. For it denotes not merely abstention from sins committed "with a high hand", nor the attainment of that standard of conduct so often claimed by the unconverted—"I have never done anyone any harm"—but also complete freedom from the commonest or most extensive type of failure even among Christians—namely sins of *omission*. And that complete freedom can only exist when there is an absolutely pure heart which sees God and his will for his human children with luminous clearness, and a life in which that heavenly vision is translated into actuality; every deed, word, and thought reproducing under human conditions the pattern laid up in the heavens. This is a standard to which only one human life has attained; and that was the life of God Incarnate.

The exegetical problem is concerned with a verse in the Epistle to the Hebrews: 4. 15. The R.V. translation is—"We have not a high priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." The clause "that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities", true and beautiful though the words are, hardly represents the writer's mind; perhaps a more accurate translation would be "that cannot share the experience of our weaknesses". And the second half of the verse continues and enlarges this thought: "but one that has been tried and tested [πεπειρασμένον] in all points after the same fashion as ourselves." πεπειρασμένον is a word of very wide meaning, but certainly has a special reference to temptation; and the general context of the epistle suggests that the temptation chiefly in the writer's mind is the temptation to fall short of a high calling because of the cost which is involved in rising to it; the cost in effort, patience, faith, hope, courage, suffering, self-sacrifice unto death. There is nothing wrong, no vestige of sin, in the shrinking of human nature from so agonizing a task; the Saviour's own prayer in the Garden of Gethsemane, that if possible the cup might pass away from him, is sufficient evidence of that. Sin only comes in if, and in so far as, this natural shrinking is allowed to override the will of God.

But the crucial words for our present purpose are the two with which the verse ends: "without sin". Here again, that translation gives a true sense, but not, I think, the sense which the writer

intended. We have to note that there is no "yet" in the Greek; and the whole run of the sentence seems to demand "tempted in all points after the same fashion as ourselves, except for sin"; or, more fully, "tempted in all points after the same fashion as ourselves, with one solitary and necessary exception: the exception that in him there was no congenital bias towards evil, nor the weakness, from which all his brother-men suffer so deeply, caused by actual sin": i.e. by yielding to temptation in time past. When once we have fallen, it becomes more difficult to resist the temptation on the next occasion; temptation is not sin, most emphatically not; but sin once committed inevitably gives an opening to further temptation, and a temptation made the stronger by our earlier failure. This melancholy process is only too familiar in the experience of us all. But it did not and could not have a place in the experience of Christ. When the Prince of this world came to attack its Saviour, he had nothing in him; nothing to lay hold of, no taking-off point for his assaults such as our sins provide for him; because in Christ there was no sin. Therefore, just in this one point, Christ was not tempted after the same fashion as ourselves; he shares the experience of our weaknesses, but not of that particular weakness which arises partly from the fallenness of our human nature, and still more from our previous consents to sin.

This does not mean that our High priest and Brother has an unfair advantage over us, if we may so speak; a privileged exemption. On the contrary it means that he, in that complete human nature which he shares with us, has resisted every temptation right through to the end, whereas we have succumbed at some earlier stage, before the full force of it, which he endured and defeated, was exerted against us. In this sense alone he is "separated from sinners"; because he is perfectly "holy, guileless, undefiled". And for this very reason, he is able to help us as he could not otherwise; because his spiritual vision is immaculately clear, and his immense resources of spiritual strength unimpaired, and therefore available for us in their fullness at every time of need.

The Christological problem is strangely ignored in many accounts of the Temptation, but it has to be faced. In its simplest form it is presented in the old dilemma: If Christ was incapable of sinning, his temptation could not have been real: if he was capable of sinning, he cannot be truly divine. It is true that dilemmas are suspect; and wise men tend to distrust the either-or approach to

human problems, which are often too complex for such easy regimentation. But this particular dilemma cannot be set aside; it does pose a very deep and necessary question, at least for all those who accept the traditional Christology of Christendom, as safeguarded by the Definition of Chalcedon. There is no problem here, of course, for those who hold a merely humanitarian or Unitarian view of Christ's Person: their problems, I believe to be greater, but they are certainly different. In what follows I am simply outlining the best explanation which I can see, as one who accepts the Definition of Chalcedon, and sets great store by that illuminating phrase of St Leo, *totus in suis, totus in nostris*.[1]

(i) First, then, the reality of our Lord's Temptation must be accepted unreservedly. The story of it can only have come from himself, and to regard that experience in the wilderness as a merely theatrical demonstration or even as a merely detached consideration of the issues which faced him, is morally and spiritually impossible. To suppose him not really tempted is to derogate from the fullness of the Incarnation; as *totus in nostris* he must have shared our temptations, and Scripture is emphatic in affirming that he did; moreover there can be no truly human goodness and moral strength except through real effort and real struggle.

(ii) Now that we have granted the reality of our Lord's temptation, are we still at liberty to say that he could not sin? Yes, provided that we remember that we are not speaking of some external compulsion, but of an interior, spiritual, necessity. This kind of necessity we habitually recognize ourselves, when we say of this or that person who is well known to us that he *could not* do a base or dishonest action. This is a true judgement if our estimate of the person concerned is correct, and in so far as his will is fixed. Certain types of action will be "out of character" for him; and we are right in saying that he "could not" act in such ways. Moreover, the certainty that he could not increases proportionately with his sanctity, his consecration of himself to God, and his reception and use of the divine grace and strength. The closer a man is to God, the more securely and the more widely he is kept from the sins which most of us commit, and the more fixed his inability to sin becomes. And this inability is not the negation but the expression of that true liberty which characterizes the children of God; that divinely given liberty which is not *posse peccare*, nor even *posse non peccare*, but *non posse peccare*;[2] the freedom of a

will conformed to the good and acceptable and perfect will of God. This conformity is found in full perfection in Christ, and that involves an equally complete inability to sin; for him sin of any kind was utterly "out of character". So St Augustine illuminatingly remarks that he could have sinned had he willed, but he could not so will; his oneness in will with the Father ruled out this possibility. *Potuit si vellet, sed velle non potuit.*[3]

(iii) We are still left with the reality of our Lord's temptation; a desperate and agonizing reality, renewed and intensified in the Garden of Gethsemane and on Calvary. I should be content myself to leave this reality and the reality of his inability to sin side by side, and unexplained; as we are bound to leave side by side and unexplained his full deity and his complete human nature; we assert the "that" but we have no exposition to offer of the "how". But it may be worth while to hazard a conjecture which at least is free, I think, from any diminishing of the one reality in the effort to maintain the other. Briefly it is this: that *our Lord could not sin, but did not know that he could not.* His knowledge as Man, just because he was truly man, *totus in nostris*, was incomplete—it was not omniscience; and the gospel tells us that he increased in wisdom. We must lay full stress on this element of growth in wisdom and knowledge if we would avoid the snare of Apollinarian or monophysite Christology. Then we may go on to ask, Did not his limitation in knowledge extend to his own Person? Could it have failed to do so? We must beware of assuming that the voice at his Baptism meant to him at the time all that it now means to us: that he was "of one substance with the Father". It did mean to him that he was the unique Messianic Son of God; but exactly what that Sonship involved was, we may suppose, part of what he had to make clear to himself in the wilderness of temptation. And that temptation was a real struggle, a hard fight, with the issue *for him* not a foregone conclusion—though *sub specie aeternitatis* it could not have ended otherwise than it did. Perhaps we may find an analogy in the struggle against some dangerous illness by a man who is destined by God not to succumb to it, though he himself is fighting for his life with no knowledge of what the issue will be. We may add also that just as the price of political liberty is eternal vigilance, so the price of spiritual liberty, the union of the human will with the divine, is constant warfare against the spiritual hosts of wickedness. Thus we

may think of our Lord as fighting through his temptations, as man, under genuinely human conditions, and not surviving them by a merely placid reliance on his divine impeccability.

All our Lord's human life is a winning through in this way—i.e. as man and under genuinely human conditions—to that which as God he already possessed by right. This is evidently true of the Ascension, which is his return, as Man, to the heavenly glory which he had with the Father before the world began; and the same truth holds, I believe, in its own measure, of this great mystery which we call the Temptation.

In any case, however we may attempt to explain the inwardness of that experience, or however frankly we leave it unexplained, we do at least know all that we need to know for our encouragement in the Christian warfare; first, that the Son of God was in all points, except that in him was no sin, tempted as we are, and has suffered being tempted, and learned obedience by the things which he suffered, and secondly that he is able to succour those that are tempted not merely as a deliverer from without, but as one who has fought our battle from within our own human nature, and is our merciful and faithful High priest because he is also our Brother.

[1] "Perfect and entire in his own divine nature, perfect and entire in that human nature which he shares with us."

[2] Ability to sin—ability to refrain from sinning—inability to sin.

[3] "He could have sinned had he so wished, but he could not so wish."

THE PAPACY AND THE DIOCESE OF ST DAVID'S, 1305-1417

(CONTINUED)

WILLIAM GREENWAY

KING AND pope might work out an effective compromise over bishoprics, but the rival systems of patronage were always liable to clash over appointments to cathedral dignities and canonries, the benefices which formed the "staple commodity of papal provision".[1] In the diocese of St David's, these benefices were the dignities and prebends of the cathedral chapter and the collegiate churches at Abergwili and Llanddewibrefi. After the Norman conquest of west Wales, the *clas* at St David's was transformed into a community of secular canons, and by the beginning of the fourteenth century twenty-two prebends had been established, including one held by the bishop himself.[2] This was the largest of the Welsh chapters, but the number of prebends was surpassed by all the English secular cathedrals save Lichfield.[3] The chapters at Lincoln and Wells had fifty-four prebends; Salisbury had fifty-two, York thirty-six, St Paul's thirty major and twelve minor canonries; Chichester and Hereford each had twenty-eight prebends, Exeter twenty-four, and Lichfield twenty-one.

The chapter at St David's was, with an important modification, organized on the traditional "four-square" basis. The office and functions of the dean were exercised not by a specially appointed cleric but by the bishop himself; he was the dean and the prebend he held was to help allay the expenses of the decanal office.[4] Otherwise the constitution of the chapter followed an orthodox pattern, a precentor being first appointed in 1224, a treasurer in 1259, and a chancellor in 1287.[5] The number of archdeacons in this sprawling diocese seems, as elsewhere, to have been determined chiefly by geographical considerations. In small compact bishoprics, like Canterbury and Ely, one was sufficient. Others, such as Hereford and Chichester, had two. At the other end of the scale, Lincoln and York had eight and five archdeaconries respectively.[6] Three of the Welsh dioceses, Llandaff, St Asaph, and Bangor, had each formed originally a single archdeaconry, though in the last-named two more—those of Anglesey and Merioneth—were added in the thirteenth century. Since 1150 at the latest, the

diocese of St David's had been divided into the four archdeaconries of St David's, Brecon, Cardigan, and Carmarthen.[7]

In the Taxation of 1291, the bishop's prebend was valued at £20, the precentor's at £8 13s. 4d., the treasurer's at £10, the chancellor's at £3 10s. 0d.[8] These portions seem rather meagre, but it is probable that they represent no more than allotments from the common fund, with other endowments not taken into account. For example, the church of Llanbadarn in Maelienydd, annexed to the treasurership in 1287,[9] would have added £5 6s. 8d. to the revenues of that office. If their prebends of Spital and Llawhaden [10] had included the parish churches of those places, then the precentor would have received an extra £8 13s. 4d. and the chancellor £17 6s. 8d. In 1364, the revenues of the chancellorship were assessed at £20 16s. 8d.,[11] a sum which appears to represent exactly the combined value of his prebend and the church of Llawhaden. By 1366, the treasurer's revenues had also risen; his prebend was now worth £10 13s. 4d., while the annexed church of Llandysilio-gogo brought in a further £10 6s. 8d.[12] Similar reservations must be made regarding the values of the archdeaconries. In 1291, the prebend of the archdeacon of St David's was valued at £2, that of the archdeacon of Brecon at £5 and that of the archdeacon of Carmarthen at £4 13s. 4d.; the fourth archdeaconry was for some reason omitted from the assessment. By 1366, however, the income of the archdeacon of St David's had risen to £14 and that of the archdeacon of Brecon to £37 13s. 4d.[13] The absence of chapter records precludes any definite conclusion, but this increase in value may have affected all the dignities and canonries at St David's.

Papal influence on the appointment of dignitaries and archdeacons appears on the whole to have been negligible. None of the precentors and chancellors was provided to his benefice or in any way connected with the papal curia, and it was not until the last decade of the century that the treasurership was thus affected. In 1393, the dignity was held by Lewis Aber, a brilliant student from the diocese of Bangor, who subsequently had acquired the status of papal chaplain and auditor.[14] He remained treasurer until 1398, when an unsuccessful attempt was made by Boniface IX to promote him to the vacant see of Bangor.[15] Although Aber never became a bishop, he seems to have made no effort to recover the benefices he formerly held.

To take Aber's place, Boniface appointed Roger Basset, who alone of the fourteenth-century treasurers of St David's had no prior connection with Wales.[16] Basset came from the diocese of Lincoln and had studied at Bologna and Cambridge, receiving financial assistance from Richard II himself while at the latter university. He left Cambridge in 1398, and in the following year was given a licence of non-residence in order to represent Bishop Mone in negotiations at Rome.[17] In May 1404, however, the pope declared the treasurership vacant, claiming that Basset had held it in conjunction with another benefice without adequate dispensation;[18] the dignity was then assigned to Maurice Ryulas, on condition that he reached an adequate standard in Latin.

The whole episode is rather obscure, but it seems probable that the papal deposition of Basset followed an appeal against the original appointment. The appellant may well have been Ryulas himself, supplying information which was evidently erroneous, for Basset was reinstated by January 1406 and remained in office until his death in 1416.[19] This is one interpretation of the case, and, if correct, it illustrates one of the disadvantages of contemporary papal government. Excessive centralization opened the way for all kinds of appeal, both genuine and frivolous, supplemented by information which was difficult to check without considerable delay and an unavoidable, though temporary, dislocation of diocesan or capitular administration. At St David's on this occasion, the functions of a treasurer may not have been performed effectively for some eighteen months.

Another occasion of protracted litigation was when the king's claim to exercise episcopal patronage during vacancies precipitated a conflict with the pope. It often happened that king and pope would appoint different clerics to the same benefice, and the outcome of this clash of rival claims depended largely on the political strength of the antagonists. In the 1350's, during a critical phase in Anglo-papal relations, two such disputes affected the archdeaconries of St David's and Carmarthen.

In October 1349, Richard Cleanger had his position as archdeacon of St David's confirmed by Clement VI.[20] Born in the neighbouring diocese of Hereford, he was a doctor of theology and a Fellow of Merton College between 1331 and 1346; the founder of that college, Walter de Merton, was an ancestor of his and another distinguished relative was Andrew Aubrey, mayor of London.

Cleanger appears to have been confirmed as archdeacon while actually at Avignon as one of the Oxford delegates submitting the roll of university graduates for papal graces. Five months later, in March 1350, John Gogh, a prominent chancery clerk who was also employed by Guy Brian, lord of Laugharne in Carmarthenshire, was presented to the same archdeaconry by Edward III.[21] After an appeal was lodged against the appointment and the case taken to the royal courts, Andrew Aubrey addressed to Clement VI a letter in commendation of his cousin, but his efforts were of little avail. Henceforward, Cleanger appears in the records as a *simplex canonicus* of St David's, while Gogh was archdeacon until at least 1359.[22] His successor, Adam Robelyn, may have had connections at Avignon, for in March 1365, two years after becoming archdeacon, he returned to England as proctor for the cardinal of St Mark's.[23] But he was also attached to the household of Adam Houghton. and it was perhaps at the instigation of the bishop that the king nominated him as archdeacon.[24]

The second dispute concerned the archdeaconry of Carmarthen. In November 1356, Howell ap David Vaughan was presented to the benefice by the king, and in the following July, the bishop of Hereford was empowered by Innocent VI, in virtue of a papal reservation of the archdeaconry, to proceed with the admission to office of Howell ap David—obviously the same person.[25] Bishop Fastolf had apparently already admitted Howell in ignorance of the alleged reservation, presumably after the royal nomination. Perhaps Innocent was anxious to uphold papal rights in theory while in practive giving way to the king. But in August, only one month after the mandate to the bishop of Hereford, David Martin, a native of Rhosmarket in Pembrokeshire and warden of the hospital of St David at Swansea, was provided to the archdeaconry at his own request.[26] He did not regard this as an expectative grace but claimed that he, not Howell, was the rightful archdeacon and appealed to the curia at Avignon. Innocent again temporized and placed Martin in succession to Howell as archdeacon. The matter appeared to resolve itself when Howell died suddenly, and Martin was confirmed as archdeacon in September 1360; then within a year he, too, was a suitor at a higher court.[27] Meanwhile, the situation had been further complicated by another royal presentation in September 1359, that of John Clyewe.[28] The king may have endeavoured to take advantage of the legal delays by intruding

another candidate as an insurance against further rebuff, but there is nothing to suggest that Clyewe was ever admitted to the archdeaconry.

It was the middle years of the century that saw the most critical developments in Anglo-papal relations.[29] Military successes against the French armies fostered anti-papal feeling in England, and a renewal of parliamentary protests against papal demands culminated in the statutes of Provisors in 1351 and Praemunire in 1353. This was the most vigorous period of Edward III's reign, and it is possible that the popes were not inclined to press to the full their claims over benefices in the less important chapters. Clement VI seems to have given way completely over the archdeaconry of St David's, and his successor was forced to compromise in the case of the archdeaconry of Carmarthen.

Another attempt to intrude papal nominees into the latter archdeaconry was made by Boniface IX in September 1404, when he provided Adam of Usk, ostensibly in place of John Walton; Walton, an Augustinian canon of Oseney who had been dispensed to hold secular benefices, was, like Adam, a papal chaplain and auditor.[30] But again it is improbable that either gained effective possession of the benefice, for Edmund Warham, one of John Gilbert's clerks, had been presented by the king in 1391 and remained archdeacon until at least 1406.[31]

It can in no way be suggested, therefore, that the pope intervened excessively in appointments to the dignities and archdeaconries at St David's, and it is instructive to compare this record with that of the king. Edward III presented David Ley, a royal clerk, to the precentorship in 1350, Robert Rees to the treasurership in the same year, and in 1361 nominated as chancellor John David, who was later appointed receiver in the counties of Cardigan and Carmarthen.[32] Two of the archdeacons of St David's, Gogh and Robelyn, were royal nominees and John Bouland, like Gogh a chancery clerk, held the benefice between 1388 and 1400.[33] Griffith ap Rhys was presented to the archdeaconry of Brecon in 1389, two royal clerks, Griffith and Philip Caunton, are to be found as archdeacons of Cardigan between 1355 and 1368, and Roger de Botall was presented by Henry IV to the same archdeaconry in 1407.[34] Griffith Caunton had previously been archdeacon of Carmarthen, to which benefice there were three presentations by the crown—Howell ap David Vaughan, John Clyewe, and Edmund Warham.

There were, therefore, ten royal appointments of dignitaries and archdeacons—all, be it noted, in the second half of the century—while three other royal officials held similar benefices, obtained, presumably, by the normal methods of episcopal collation. Papal influence over these benefices seems to have been rather less potent than that of the king. At Hereford, on the other hand, nine clear cases of papal provision to dignities and archdeaconries between 1307 and 1377 more than counterbalanced only four instances of royal intervention.[35]

At the collegiate churches of Abergwili and Llanddewibrefi there were fewer dignities. The chapter of the former foundation was modelled on that of the mother church at St David's, with twenty-two prebends, one of which was held by the bishop in his capacity as dean; it was not until 1334 that the offices of precentor, treasurer, and chancellor were established by Henry de Gower.[36] At Llanddewbrefi, the original endowment was for a precentor and twelve canons, but in 1368 a treasurer was appointed by Bishop Houghton to help remedy lapses in discipline caused by increasing non-residence on the part of the canons.[37] The collegiate dignities were thus of late creation and fewer in number than their counterparts at the cathedral, and there are only two recorded instances of papal provision. In 1358, William Coke of Haverford was provided by Innocent VI to the precentorship at Abergwili, and in 1400, Boniface IX appointed Howell ap Maredudd as chancellor of the same college.[38] There is no evidence to suggest that these provisions were ever effective, and the letters of appointment perhaps indicate why this was so: Coke was offered the parish church of Lampeter as an alternative to the precentorship, while Howell ap Maredudd's promotion was dependent on his passing an examination in Latin.

Two conclusions emerge from this study of the dignitaries. One is that papal control of appointments was extremely limited;[39] secondly, papal candidates were for the most part either natives of the diocese or from other regions of Wales.[40] This is true of Adam Robelyn, Lewis Aber, Howell ap David Vaughan, David Martin, Adam of Usk, Howell ap Maredudd, and William Coke; Richard Cleanger came from the border diocese of Hereford; only Roger Basset, from the diocese of Lincoln, and John Walton, the Augustinian canon of Oseney, were from further afield.

Finally, we have to examine the effect of papal patronage on the *simplices canonici*, the clergy who formed the majority of the capitular personnel and occupied the benefices most subject to papal intervention. At St David's, fourteen of the prebends were held by ordinary canons; at Abergwili, twenty-one, then eighteen after 1334; at Llanddewibrefi, twelve, then eleven after 1368. The Taxation of 1291 showed that of fifteen ordinary prebends at St David's,[41] one was worth £3 13s. 4d., two £3 6s. 8d., seven £2 13s. 4d., two £2 10s. 8d., one £2 6s. 8d., and two £2 os. od., but these figures, like those concerning the dignities, must be accepted with some reservation. Again they may represent no more than allotments from the common fund, for it is clear that prebendal churches were valued separately. The prebends at the collegiate churches were not included in the valuation.

One method of assessing papal influence on the capitular clergy is to examine the letters of provision actually issued. These amounted to seventy-five in all—thirty-three to St David's, thirty-two to Abergwili, ten to Llanddewibrefi.[42] Of these provisions, Clement VI was responsible for twenty, John XXII and Boniface IX for eighteen each, Innocent VI for fourteen, Innocent VII for three, and Benedict XII and Urban V for one each.[43] Clement V, Gregory XI, Urban VI, and Gregory XII issued no letters of provision to canonries in the diocese. The provisions, therefore, fall into three well-defined periods: eighteen between 1317 and 1333 (10:7:1); thirty-four between 1343 and 1361 (18:11:5); twenty-one between 1389 and 1406 (5:12:4). The remaining two provisions were made to Abergwili in 1336 and 1365.

This pattern seems to have been determined partly by the character and policy of individual popes and partly by the reaction that papal demands provoked in England. Centralization of ecclesiastical government at Avignon had begun under Clement V, but the greatest developments in this field occurred during the pontificates of John XXII and Clement VI, when letters of provision were issued on an unprecedented scale.[44] The extension of taxes such as annates made provisions financially important and the large number of benefices reserved to the pope by the constitution *Ex debito* attracted to the papal court a host of petitioners seeking ecclesiastical preferment. The tide was stemmed for a while by the stringent measures of the austere Cistercian, Benedict XII, but his successor, Clement VI, proved to be even more lavish than John

XXII in granting provisions and benefice hunters once more thronged to Avignon. The pattern of provisions at St David's was thus reflecting a trend which must have affected all Europe. Innocent VI, however, though renewing the traditions of Benedict XII,[45] was not far behind Clement and John in the provisions made to canonries in the three chapters.

The financial straits in which the treasury at Avignon frequently found itself were in part the consequence of luxury and venality, but much papal expenditure went on making war in Italy in defence of the temporal power. Boniface IX did not suffer from this drain on his resources, for he inherited the stable government of the papal states established by Albornoz, and by his death in 1404 he was as complete a master of central Italy as any of his predecessors.[46] Yet despite this recovery, Boniface faced difficulties far graver than those confronting the Avignon popes, since half of western Europe had defected to the cause of the anti-pope. In this unprecedented situation, Boniface had recourse to new measures. Indulgences were, for the first time, subject to financial exploitation, novel conditions were attached to the celebration of the jubilee year in 1390, and there was a renewed outburst of papal provisions, often conducted on a purely mercenary basis.[47] Again it is apparent that St David's was experiencing a phenomenon common to all the countries that remained firm in their allegiance to the Roman pope.

This, however, is to look at the problem from only one point of view, proceeding on the assumptions that papal provision could operate as freely at one time as another and that the attitude of king and parliament was a constant factor. In a consideration of the reactions of the English government, the provisions to benefices in the diocese of St David's can again be seen to fall into three chronological divisions. Between 1317 and 1351, under John XXII and Clement VI, there were thirty-eight provisions (23:13:2); in the next ten years there was a sharp drop to fifteen (5:6:4), then a solitary provision in 1365; after that there were no more provisions until those issued by Boniface and his immediate successor. In other words, the number of provisions dropped by over a half after the statute of Provisors and disappeared altogether from its re-issue in 1365 until the rather abnormal circumstances of Boniface IX's pontificate. Again we may compare St David's with Hereford.[48] In that diocese, seventy-six papal provisions to

canonries were made between 1305 and 1360, twelve between 1360 and 1369, then there is little trace of papal interference until 1389. The pattern is therefore roughly the same as at St David's and the same question arises: has the effectiveness of the anti-papal legislation been underestimated in the past? Anti-clericalism and anti-papalism were certainly rife at this time. In 1365, a papal demand for the arrears of tribute according to the terms of King John's submission aroused fierce opposition and the statutes of Provisors and Praemunire were renewed in the same year. The following decade saw the attack on the clerical ministers and the rise of Wycliffe as a critic of traditional ecclesiastical interests.[49] The re-enactment of the statutes in 1365 is said to have had little effect generally on the number of provisions,[50] but the decline at Hereford and St David's can hardly have been coincidental. The renewal of provisions under Boniface IX is to be explained by the financial considerations outlined above and by the pope's intransigence regarding ecclesiastical appointments during the critical early years of his pontificate.[51]

What type of cleric benefited from papal provision? This is answered by examining the chapters separately. Of thirty-three provisions to the cathedral chapter, four were of royal clerks. Two of these, however, were involved in litigation about the same prebend, to which Richard Turberville claimed to have been collated by Bishop Gower; although John Coke had two papal letters issued in his favour, it is doubtful whether he was successful in his suit.[52] The other two were Richard Vaughan, a diplomatic envoy and chaplain to Archbishop Stratford, and Walter de Salop, keeper of the royal mines in Cornwall.[53] All four were clerks of Edward III.

Three, probably five, were in the service of the nobility. Philip Caunton, later to enter the royal administration and to become archdeacon of Cardigan, was employed by the Black Prince,[54] and Richard de Haningfield and Richard Garland by Laurence Hastings, earl of Pembroke, and William de Bohun, earl of Northampton.[55] The former earl also petitioned for Walter Alexander's provision, and it is likely that Geoffrey de Bikelswade was in the household of Henry of Lancaster.[56] Five others had connections among the lower aristocracy. Peter de Berkeley was the son of Sir Maurice de Berkeley of Gloucestershire and was to enter the service of the Crown in 1327, seven years after being provided to St David's; he must have been one of the youngest papal provisors ever, for in

1330 he was still under canonical age.[57] John Seys and David Vaughan were employed by Guy Brian, lord of Laugharne, and William de Osberstone subsequently joined the same household, though at the time of his provision he was the treasurer of Hugh Despenser.[58] Finally, Robert de Whitney, from the diocese of Hereford, was the son of Sir Eustace de Whitney.[59]

Of those who benefited from ecclesiastical patronage, only one, John Trevor, was a papal chaplain, but three were in the households of cardinals—Thomas de Aschele, Richard Possewick and Thomas Karlelle.[60] Philip Martin was a clerk under Adam Houghton, whose brother Philip was another provisor,[61] and Richard de la Barre and John de Bodringham, brother of the senior proctor at Oxford, were provided at the requests of the bishop of Exeter and the archbishop of Armagh.[62] Of the remaining ten provisors, nine are no more than names, though Madoc ap Meuric, archdeacon of Anglesey, and Robert de Middelond, treasurer of Exeter, held positions of some consequence.[63] The tenth was Richard Cleanger, of Merton College, who received some consolation for his disappointment over the archdeaconry of St David's by being provided to a canonry and prebend.[64]

Those provided to Abergwili and Llanddewibrefi had a similar variety of background. At Abergwili, three, possibly five, were royal clerks. William de Melbourne, Thomas Brambre, Edward III's secretary, and Thomas Forster were certainly in the royal service, the last-named under Richard II; John de Malley was provided on the request of Queen Isabella and Philip Bernardini on that of her son.[65] The only noble's retainer, Hugh Charles, a clerk of the earl of Warwick, had been deprived of his canonry by Adam Houghton before 1366,[66] and only three others had aristocratic connections. Philip Caunton and John Seys, clerks of Guy Brian, have already been encountered at St David's, and the third, Yvo de Berkeley, was the elder son of Sir Maurice de Berkeley.[67] He was provided to a canonry at Abergwili on the same day that his young brother Peter was appointed by John XXII to a similar benefice at St David's.

Two of the provisors, John Trevor and Adam of Usk, were papal chaplains, and another who had also been provided to St David's was Philip Martin, Adam Houghton's protégé.[68] Walter Carles was in the service of Bishop Orleton of Hereford and Robert de Coventry, provided at the request of the abbot and convent of St Alban's, was likewise indebted to clerical patronage.[69] To this

group may be added Thomas de Eltisley, provided in 1365;[70] this was possibly the first Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, but he is more likely the cleric of the same name who was chaplain to Bishop Roger Craddock (translated from Waterford to Llandaff in 1361) and was provided to the archdeaconry of Llandaff in 1363.[71] Little is known of the remaining eighteen provisors at Abergwili.[72]

Of ten provisors at Llanddewibrefi, Roger de Baskerville and John Golaffre had worked for the crown, and John Seys, Guy Brian's secretary, appears yet again.[73] William de Tyderlye, employed by Archbishop Islip, later entered the service of Bishop Edington of Winchester, and John de Tefford was in the household of William Airmyn, bishop of Norwich.[74] Other familiar names are those of John Trevor and Richard Possewick,[75] but the remaining three are unknown clerics.[76]

From this survey of the three chapters, two conclusions emerge. The first is that the number of provisors in any way connected with the papal curia or the college of cardinals was very small; it was the king, nobility, landed aristocracy, and bishops rather than the pope who profited by getting their own officials provided. Secondly, Owain Glyn Dwr's implication that papal provisions were used to intrude hosts of Englishmen to Welsh benefices was in some respects an exaggeration; at least twenty of the seventy-five letters of provision were in favour of Welshmen. Papal support of native clergy was especially noticeable during the pontificate of Boniface IX, covering the period immediately preceding the Glyn Dwr revolt, when eleven out of eighteen provisions favoured Welsh clerics. Nor did aliens benefit unduly from provisions. The only alien provisor was Richard Possewick, a native of Avignon, who joined a cardinal's household and held canonries in places as far afield as Rome, Dublin, Maastricht, and Orvieto; he was not more than nineteen years old at the time of being provided.[77] Philip Bernardini may have been another alien, but the total number, whether provided or appointed by episcopal authority, formed only a minute proportion of the capitular clergy. An inquiry in 1384 showed that only two aliens, Samuel de Wykes and Cardinal Donati of Venice, both canons of St David's, held benefices in the diocese;[78] the former was permanently resident in England, the latter presumably not. Earlier in the century, in 1330, another canonry was held by Nigel de Wavere, Chancellor of Oxford

University, who was a native of Cahors in Guienne and had been a Fellow of Merton College in 1312.[79] Cahors was also the birthplace of John XXII, who may have had a hand in the promotion of his fellow-countryman, but it is probable that Wavere owed his prebend to the influence of Henry de Gower, a contemporary of his at Merton. The only other alien was Hugh of Angoulême, who in 1331 resigned his prebend at Abergwili on being appointed bishop of Carpentras, near Avignon.[80]

As recent historians have emphasized, the initiative in the system of provisions lay not with the pope but with individual petitioners, either requesting appointment to particular benefices on their own behalf or procuring the mediation of persons of note. Between 1342 and 1363 sixty such petitions concerning canonries in the diocese of St David's were presented at Avignon. Twenty-four of these were made without the backing of any patron. Of the remaining thirty-six, nine were supported by ecclesiastics, including some bishops, and eight by members of the aristocracy, including Guy Brian on four occasions. Various nobles gave their support to five petitions, administrative officials were responsible for three, the universities of Oxford and Cambridge for four each. What is surprising is that the Black Prince petitioned the pope on only two occasions and the king but once. This neglect of papal patronage as a method of furthering royal interests is explicable on two counts. In the first place, after the death of Henry de Gower in 1347 there was appointed to St David's a succession of bishops trained in the royal service and likely to accede to any requests for benefices for the king's candidates; secondly, the king was able to capitalize on several episcopal vacancies in the second half of the century by presenting his own nominees to canonries. For example, forty royal clerks appear in the cathedral chapter between 1343 and 1400 compared with nineteen in the previous sixty years. Many of these would have been collated by the ordinary, but the king himself was able to make thirty-two presentations to canonries after 1347, after only three in the earlier period. The same pattern is discernible at Abergwili and Llanddewibrefi, where the numbers of royal clerks rose from thirteen and four before 1343 to forty-four and sixteen afterwards. The king was also able to make thirty-two prebendal appointments at Abergwili and twenty at Llanddewibrefi after 1343, whereas before that date he had made only five nominations at Abergwili and none at the sister foundation. With such sources

of patronage at their disposal, Edward III and Richard II could ignore the opportunities afforded by petitioning the pope.

Sixty petitions were forwarded to the pope and were all, save for one cancellation, recorded as having been granted. Only in thirty-five instances, however, is there record of the issue of a separate letter of provision. This discrepancy is found particularly during the pontificate of Urban V, when no separate letters of provision were issued in response to eighteen petitions. These figures must be treated with some reserve, for the returns of pluralists in 1366 show that, by that year, Geoffrey de Saling, who had petitioned Urban in 1363, had acquired a canonry and prebend at St David's.[81] No letter of provision had been issued in his favour and he may have been appointed by episcopal collation, but two other petitioners of the same year had certainly been provided by 1366. These were Ralph de Langley, Master of Michaelhouse at Cambridge, and John Skoret of Buckingham,[82] though they were both still awaiting prebends. Petitioners might also request provision to any benefice in the gift of the bishop of St David's and fourteen of these petitions were presented at Avignon between 1342 and 1363, though only one was followed by provision to a canonry. In 1362, the earl of Warwick petitioned Urban V for a benefice for his clerk, Hugh Charles.[83] In response to his request, Charles was provided to a canonry at Abergwili, but within four years had been deprived of his benefice by Bishop Houghton.

In the examination of relations between the papacy and the diocese of Hereford, it was noted that the number of provisors eventually obtaining prebends declined as the century progressed, and it was suggested that this may have been attributable to the anti-papal legislation of the 1350's.[84] The dearth of chapter records prevents our arriving at any definite conclusion regarding St David's, but some figures indicate that a similar trend may have been in operation. By using various sources, it can be estimated that at least eight of thirty-three provisors subsequently obtained prebends in the cathedral chapter; at Abergwili and Llanddewibrefi the proportions were three out of thirty-two and one out of ten. All the successful candidates had acquired possession of their prebends before 1360. What can be stated with some certainty is that none of the mandates of provision issued by Boniface IX and Innocent VII were executed; at any rate, no provisors appear in

the lists of institutions to benefices contained in the bishops' registers between 1397 and 1410.

After 1347, all the bishops of St David's were appointed by papal provision. In some instances, the pope appears to have taken the initiative in this procedure; the appointments of Thoresby, Fastolf, and Gilbert are cases in point. Yet the overwhelming impression is that provision was hardly more than a formality, since papal policy was closely bound up with the needs of English government; consequently the attitude of the king counted for far more than the inclinations of individual popes. With the exception of Thomas Fastolf, the bishops of St David's between 1347 and 1417 were intimately connected with the court and the royal administration, and even Fastolf was representing the Crown at the Avignon conference of 1344. Changes in the political situation might occasionally be turned to the advantage of the papacy, as in the translation of John Gilbert from Hereford, but for the most part only clerics acceptable to the king or dominant aristocratic faction were provided to the bishopric of St David's.

Papal influence on the composition of the cathedral and collegiate chapters in the diocese was also strictly limited. The offices of precentor, treasurer, and chancellor in the three chapters were scarcely affected by papal patronage; neither were the archdeaconries. Provisors never formed more than 15% of the capitular personnel, while in reality the proportion was probably a good deal lower. Some of the provisors were officials of the papal curia or employed in the households of cardinals, but these were greatly outnumbered by canons favoured by king, nobles, aristocracy, bishops, and universities. Very few aliens were provided, and Welshmen received, on the whole, fairly adequate representation. Apart from a spate of seemingly ineffective mandates issued by Boniface IX, the number of provisions dropped sharply after 1350 and they disappeared altogther after 1365. With these considerations in mind, the popes of the fourteenth century can hardly be accused of exploiting benefices in the diocese for their own purposes. Compared with the record of the crown, papal intervention in appointments to canonries was not at all extensive. St David's was not, of course, typical of the dioceses in England and Wales, and it is probable that chapters such as York, Lincoln, and Salisbury, possessing more lucrative prebends, were affected by papal provisions to a far greater extent. But the evidence at St

David's, taken in conjunction with that of Hereford, suggests that, as far as the smaller and poorer chapters were concerned, the effects of papal centralization on the English clergy have in the past been exaggerated. The decisive influence on the composition of both the hierarchy and the cathedral chapters was exercised not by the papacy, but by the king.[85]

1 F. W. Maitland, *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England* (Cambridge 1898), p. 67.

2 *Taxatio . . . Papae Nicholai IV* (Record Comm. 1802), p. 274; Brit. Mus. Harl. MS. 6280, fos. 25 (r)–26 (r); *Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1385-8*, p. 279.

3 K. Edwards, *The English Secular Cathedrals in the Middle Ages* (Manchester, 1949), p. 33.

4 *Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1370-4*, p. 294.

5 J. Conway Davies, *Episcopal Acts . . . relating to Welsh Dioceses, 1066-1272* (2 vols. Hist. Soc. of the Church in Wales, 1946-8), II, 602.

6 A. Hamilton Thompson, *The English Clergy*, p. 58.

7 A. Hamilton Thompson, "The Welsh Medieval Dioceses", *Journal of the Historical Soc. of the Church in Wales*, vol. I, no. 2, p. 99.

8 *Taxatio*, p. 274. 9 Brit. Mus. Harl. MS. 6280, fo. 69 (r).

10 Ibid., fos. 4 (r), 10 (v). 11 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1362-1404*, p. 45.

12 *Reg. Simonis Langham*, ed. A. C. Wood (Cant. and York. Soc., 1956), p. 31. 13 Ibid., pp. 31-2.

14 J. R. Gabriel, *Arch. Camb.*, 1923, pp. 75-6; *Reg. Trefnant*, p. 389. Aber may have been the Lewis who was treasurer of St David's in 1383 (*Reg. St. David's*, II, 629).

15 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1396-1404*, p. 179; *Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1396-9*, p. 451.

16 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1396-1404*, pp. 24, 179; *Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1391-6*, pp. 208, 219; *Reg. St. David's*, I. 93. See also J. and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, Part I (4 vols. Cambridge, 1922-7), I, 104.

17 *Reg. St David's*, I. 141. 18 *Cal. Papal Letters*, 1396-1404, p. 580.

19 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1404-15*, p. 124.

20 For this and subsequent references to Cleanger, see A. B. Emden, *Biographical Register*, I, pp. 430-1.

21 *Cal. Pat Rolls, 1348-50*, pp. 486, 589-90; B. Wilkinson, *The Chancery under Edward III*, pp. 165-6.

22 Brit. Mus. Harl. MS. 6280, fo. 35 (v); *Cal. Papal Letters, 1342-62*, pp. 444, 566, 568, 583; *Cal. Papal Petitions*, i, 279; *Cal. Close Rolls, 1354-60*, pp. 73, 643. Cleanger was not, as is stated by Emden, archdeacon in 1359.

23 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1362-1404*, p. 51.

24 *Cal. Papal Petitions*, i, 380; *Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1361-4*, p. 302.

25 *Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1354-8*, p. 477; *Cal. Papal Letters, 1342-62*, p. 581.

26 *Cal. Papal Petitions*, i, 300; *Cal. Papal Letters, 1342-62*, p. 581.

27 *Cal. Papal Petitions*, i, 300, 316, 358; *Cal. Pat Rolls, 1361-4*, p. 49.

28 *Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1358-61*, p. 301. Le Neve gives the date, incorrectly, as 1347.

29 W. A. Pantin, *The English Church in the XIV Century*, pp. 81-7.

30 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1396-1404*, p. 195; *1404-15*, pp. 44-5.

31 *Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1388-92*, p. 478; *Reg. St. David's*, I, 339.

32 *Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1348-50*, p. 461; *1361-4*, pp. 48, 114; *1385-8*, p. 538.

33 *Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1385-8*, p. 524; *Reg. St. David's*, I, 173, 175; B. Wilkinson, *The Chancery under Edward III*, p. 177.

34 Brit. Mus. Harl. MS. 6280, fos. 19 (r), 49 (r); *Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1330-4*, p. 260: *1361-4*, pp. 126, 135; *1405-8*, p. 383; *Reg. St. David's*, II, 409.

35 J. T. Driver, *Church Quart. Rev.*, vol. CXLV, 1947, p. 37.

36 Brit. Mus. Harl. MS. 6280, fos. 89 (r)-92 (v); W. Dugdale, *Monasticon*, VI, pt. 3, 1332-3, 1376. The college was founded in 1283 at Llangadock and transferred to Abergwili some four years later.

37 Brit. Mus. Harl. MS. 6280, fos. 19 (v)-20 (r), 50 (v)-52 (v); W. Dugdale, *Monasticon*, VI, pt. 3, 1475; *Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1348-50*, p. 27; *1377-81*, p. 273.

38 *Cal. Papal Petitions*, i, 307; *Cal. Papal Letters, 1396-1404*, p. 339.

39 For purposes of comparison, the number of dignitaries traced during the period is as follows: St David's: precentors 6, treasurers 9, chancellors 6, archdeacons of St David's 8, of Brecon 4, of Cardigan 8, of Carmarthen 11. Abergwili: precentors 7, chancellors 4, treasurers 2. Llanddewibrefi: precentors 2, treasurers 1. The proportion of papal provisors was thus comparatively small. In reality, the proportion was probably smaller still, since registers and chapter records, had they survived from before 1397, would surely have revealed more dignitaries, with little corresponding increase in the number of provisors.

40 By "papal candidates" I mean both those who were actually provided and those in the service of pope or cardinals.

41 One of these must have been held by the archdeacon of Cardigan, who was omitted from the list of dignities.

42 I have traced the following numbers of canons in the three chapters (excluding dignitaries and archdeacons): St David's 138, Abergwili 161, Llanddewibrefi 68. The ratios in this paragraph are given in the same order.

43 Clement VI, 13: 6: 1; John XXII, 10: 7: 1; Boniface IX, 3: 11: 4; Innocent VI, 5: 5: 4; Innocent VII, 2: 1: 0; Benedict XII and Urban V each made one provision to Abergwili.

44 G. Mollat, *Les Papes d'Avignon*, pp. 32, 44-6, 85-7.

45 Ibid., p. 100.

46 Peter Partner, *History Today*, vol. VII, Nov. 1957, p. 772.

47 Philip Hughes, *History of the Church* (3 vols. London, 1947), III, p. 258.

48 J. T. Driver, *Church Quart. Review*, vol. CXLV, 1947, pp. 38-41.

49 W. A. Pantin, *The English Church in the XIV Century*, p. 88.

50 M. McKisack, *The Fourteenth Century*, p. 278.

51 W. A. Pantin, op. cit., pp. 91-2.

52 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1342-62*, pp. 199, 237, 238; *Cal. Papal Petitions*, i, 84, 86, 106, 115; *Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1354-8*, pp. 481, 523.

53 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1305-42*, p. 275, *1342-62*, p. 220; *Cal. Papal Petitions*, i, 106, 107, 127, 336; *Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1327-30*, p. 318.

54 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1342-62*, pp. 280, 545; *Cal. Papal Petitions*, i, 154, 179; *Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1361-4*, pp. 126, 135; Brit. Mus. Harl. MS. 6280, fo. 19 (r).

55 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1342-62*, pp. 280, 497; Cal. Papal Petitions, i, 162, 243; *Reg. Sudbury* (Cant. and York Soc.), II, 171-2.

56 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1305-42*, pp. 143, 344; *Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1327-30*, p. 442.

57 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1305-42*, p. 204; A. B. Emden, *Biographical Register*, I, p. 175; *Cal. of Ancient Correspondence concerning Wales*, ed. J. G. Edwards (Cardiff, 1935), p. 173.

58 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1342-62*, pp. 100, 316; *Cal. Papal Petitions*, i, 24, 220, 318, 389; *Cal. Pat. Rolls. 1343-5*, p. 279. *1354-8*, p. 394; *Reg. Langham*, p. 38.

59 *Reg. Langham*, pp. 33, 42; *Cal. Papal Letters, 1342-62*, p. 101; *Cal. Papal Petitions*, i, 70.

60 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1362-1404*, pp. 343, 427, 481. *1305-42*, p.355. *1362-1404*, pp. 467, 475. *1396-1404*, pp. 80, 576-7.

61 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1342-62*, p. 480; *Cal. Papal Petitions*, i, 323, 380.

62 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1342-62*, pp. 102, 134; *Cal. Papal Petitions*, i, 64; A. B. Emden, *Biographical Register*, I, 209; *Reg. Langham*, pp. 33, 42-3.

63 The other seven were Walter de Barwe, John de Baskerville, John de Boys, John de Frechevill, John Hayward, Richard de Hoo, and Thomas Tholite. *Cal. Papal Letters, 1305-42*, pp. 195, 232, 241, 259, 308, 345. *1342-62*, pp. 151, 592. *1404-15*, pp. 43, 85, 491; Cal. Papal Petitions, i, 205, 328.

64 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1342-62*, p. 294; *Cal. Papal Petitions*, i, 150.

65 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1305-42*, pp. 283, 315, 343. *1342-62*, p. 203. *1362-1404*, p. 81; *Cal. Papal Petitions*, i, 93, 101, 135, 142; *Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1327-30*, p. 322. *1388-92*, p. 424.

66 *Reg. Langham*, pp. 88-9.

67 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1305-42*, p. 204. *1342-62*, pp. 421, 545.

68 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1362-1404*, p. 343. *1404-15*, pp. 44-5; *Cal. Papal Petitions*, i, 323.

69 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1305-42*, p. 195. *1342-62*, p. 395; *Cal. Papal Petitions*, i, 172; *Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1317-21*, p. 564.

70 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1362-1404*, p. 47.

71 R. Masters, *The History of the College of Corpus Christi* (Cambridge, 1853), pp. 17-27; *Cal. Papal Petitions*, i, 424, 490.

72 Richard de Auste, Hugh de Braynton, John Bremore, Gruffydd ap David, Richard "Deakene" of Walden, Richard ap Eynon Syw, Walter de Fenton, Robert ap Gwilym Schefft, David Gwyn, John Halle, John ap Iorwerth, Thomas Leche, Alexander Millock, John Moret, John Petit, Richard Prophete, John Tegle "ap David", and Thomas Wybb. *Cal. Papal Letters, 1305-42*, pp. 259, 392, 530. *1342-62*, pp. 99, 134, 296, 545. *1362-1404*, pp. 381, 405, 417, 467. *1396-1404*, pp. 165, 343, 412-13, 581, 615. *1404-15*, p. 44; *Cal. Papal Petitions*, i, 309, 319.

73 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1305-42*, p. 195. *1342-62*, pp. 102, 567; *Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1313-17*, pp. 109, 136, 253, 496, 683. *1317-21*, p. 536. 1343-5, pp. 181, 285, 407, 586. *1345-8*, p. 98.

74 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1342-62*, pp. 518, 567; *Cal. Papal Petitions*, i, 41, 46, 239, 276, 328.

75 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1362-1404*, pp. 343, 475.

76 Richard ap Eynon Syw, Geoffrey Garden, John ap Rhys ap Gruffydd. *Cal. Papal Letters, 1396-1404*, pp. 581, 615. *Cal. Papal Petitions*, i, 307.

77 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1396-1404*, p. 80.

78 *Cal. of Ancient Correspondence concerning Wales*, p. 196.

79 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1305-42*, p. 324; F. M. Powicke, *Medieval Books of Merton College* (Oxford, 1931), p. 122; G. C. Brodrick, *Memorials of Merton College* (Oxford Hist. Soc., 1885), p. 194; *Snappe's Formulary*, ed. H. E. Salter (Oxford Hist. Soc., 1924), p. 75.

80 *Cal. Papal Letters, 1305-42*, p. 396.

81 *Reg. Langham*, pp. 55-6; *Cal. Papal Petitions*, i, 417.

82 *Reg. Langham*, p. 6; *Cal. Papal Petitions*, i, 404, 441, 488, 526; *Cal. Papal Letters, 1362-1404*, pp. 55-6, 72.

83 *Cal. Papal Petitions*, i, 389; *Reg. Langham*, pp. 88-9.

84 J. T. Driver, art. cit., p. 41.

85 I wish to thank Professor Glanmor Williams and Dr David Walker for their helpful advice in the preparation of this article.

THE EUCHARIST AND THE REMISSION OF SINS

J. G. DAVIES

LITURGICAL revision, like matrimony, is not to be enterprised or taken in hand unadvisedly or lightly. The would-be reviser or revising commission is faced with the task of achieving a delicate balance without succumbing to the dangers of archaism or modernism. The former rests upon the romantic fallacy of a Golden Age when the liturgy was pure and unadulterated, and the attitude of mind underlying it may be exemplified by the Gothic revival in architecture of the last century. It fails to recognize that not all liturgical development is to be condemned, and it may result in a noble but vain attempt to reverse the historical process. Modernism rests upon the anti-intellectual fallacy that the past has nothing to teach us and that all that is required is a full understanding of the contemporary situation, and the attitude of mind underlying it may be exemplified by the extremes of the liberal movement in theology in the early years of this century. It fails to recognize that not even the present moment is absolute, and it may result in an obscurantist neglect of the past and in a failure to garner the riches of the Church's inheritance. But the reviser must have not only a profound knowledge and understanding of the liturgies of the past and of the sociological and intellectual situation of modern man; he must also have a clear insight into the meaning of the liturgy. Granted that the liturgy is primarily action, that action must be accompanied by words which make its meaning explicit and must not include elements which may obscure it—this necessarily involves sacramental theology.

One aspect of sacramental theology, which has been touched upon in an article in a previous number of this journal,[1] concerns the effects or fruits of communion and, in particular, whether they include the forgiveness of sins. If the Eucharist does convey forgiveness of sins, then it is arguable that an absolution should have no place in a revised rite. Since I have been charged with dealing "rather summarily with queries about this",[2] some further consideration[3] of the theology involved may be in order.

There are discernible two opposing tendencies in sacramental theology, the one represented by a Protestant and the other by a

Catholic extremism. Both share the same idea of salvation as a past event, but while the Protestant holds that a return to it may be made by faith, which becomes a kind of intellectual or sentimental act of remembering, the Catholic holds to an infinite repetition of the redemptive act, which issues in a kind of sacramental automatism. A balanced Christian theology supports the view that in Christ the historical act of redemption is made present in faith and in the sacrament; through the Eucharist the historical saving act is applied to men now that it may be received in and by faith. Through the anamnesis of the mystery, the fruits of Christ's once for all sacrifice are conveyed in the present. If this thesis be correct, and I am no more than summarizing the very widespread contemporary understanding of the dynamic action of the Eucharist,[4] then to be united with Christ, really and substantially, in the eucharistic offering by communion, is to receive the benefits of his expiatory sacrifice, and included amongst these must be the forgiveness of sins.

That this is indeed so according to New Testament teaching may be seen from the Matthean explanatory gloss upon the words of Christ at the Last Supper and from St Paul's eschatological reference to the proclamation of the Lord's death till he come.[5] There is no reason to dispute Bultmann's verdict that the Matthean addition "unto remission of sins" (26. 28) to the words "poured out for many" (Mark 14. 24) or "for you" (1 Cor. 11. 24), which interpret Christ's death as an expiatory sacrifice for sin, is "a correct exegesis".[6] By his blood shed on the cross, Christ was going to reconcile man to God and blot out the sin which divided them; at the Last Supper his disciples received the fruit of this imminent sacrifice in advance, and this sacrifice was to be for the remission of sins. At the Eucharist, Christ, our High Priest, is the celebrant; he it is who "consecrates" the wine that it may be unto us his blood poured out for many unto remission of sins. "The cross alone *has established* the new covenant with God by the blood of Christ shed for the remission of sins, but the Eucharist at the present day *confirms* us in that covenant and re-establishes us in union with God by securing the remission of sins for us now."[7] "The blood of the Eucharist is the very blood that Christ bore from the cross into the heavenly sanctuary, and it is the symbol of His unceasing intercession for the remission of sins, for the present reconciliation and unity of all men with the Father."[8]

St Paul's statement, at the end of his account of the Last Supper, equally affirms the present reality of forgiveness through participation in the Eucharist. "For as oft as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come" (1 Cor. 11. 26). To proclaim is to make a solemn pronouncement, as by a herald, of a divine act; but this proclamation involves the present effectiveness of the divine act declared. Moreover St Paul uses the indicative and not the imperative; he is asserting that by the celebration "you perform a solemn proclamation" of the Lord's death. "To proclaim the Lord's death means to make present in the eucharistic action, illuminated by the Word of God, the unique event of the redemptive death of Christ, of His sacrifice on the cross"[9]—and therefore to mediate present participation in its fruits, amongst which the forgiveness of sins.

This understanding of the Eucharist, that it involves participation in the forgiveness of sins, finds frequent expression in the Fathers. According to Hippolytus: "He has given us his sacred flesh and his precious blood to eat and drink for remission of sins."[10] According to Cyprian: "When the blood of the Lord and the cup of salvation have been drunk, the memory of the old man is laid aside, and there arises an oblivion of the former worldly conversation, and the sorrowful and sick breast which was oppressed before by tormenting sins is eased by the joy of the divine mercy."[11] According to Dionysius of Alexandria, when a presbyter was unable to come and hear the confession of a dying man, he sent a boy with "a small portion of the Eucharist, bidding him soak it and let it fall in drops down the old man's mouth. Was it not plain that he was preserved and remained until he had obtained release, that, with his sins blotted out, he might be acknowledged for all the good deeds he had done?"[12] According to Ambrose: "Therefore as often as thou receivest—what saith the Apostle to thee?—as often as we receive, we show the Lord's death; if we show his death, we show remission of sins. If, as often as blood is poured forth, it is poured for remission of sins, I ought always to receive it, that my sins may always be forgiven me. I, who am always sinning, ought always to have a remedy.[13] "As often as thou drinkest, thou receivest remission of sins."[14] "Whosoever eateth this body shall have remission of sins."[15] "Dost thou hear that as often as sacrifice is offered, the Lord's death, the Lord's resurrection, the Lord's ascension and the remission of sins is signified, and dost

thou not take this bread of life daily? He who has a wound needs a medicine. The wound is that we are under sin; the medicine is the heavenly and venerable sacrament."[16] The *Apostolic Constitutions* speak of the reverence due to bishops, and states that they are to be loved "as your benefactors and ambassadors with God, who have regenerated you by water, and endued you with the fullness of the Holy Spirit, who have fed you with the Word as with milk, who have nourished you with doctrine, who have confirmed you by their admonitions, who have imparted to you the saving body and precious blood of Christ, who have loosed you from your sins, who have made you partakers of the holy and sacred Eucharist, who have admitted you to be partakers and fellow-heirs of the promise of God."[17]

It is to be expected that this undeniable strand in patristic teaching about the Eucharist should find expression in the early liturgies, and this is indeed the case.

In the liturgy of the Eighth Book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, immediately after the Epiclesis, there is the petition that "those who are partakers thereof may be strengthened for piety, may obtain remission of their sins, may be delivered from the devil and his deceit".[18] Four references are to be noted in the Liturgy of Chrysostom: in the intercession prior to the dismissal of the catechumens, there is the petition: "We pray for forgiveness . . . and remission of sins";[19] at the time of the fanning of the oblation, "that they may be to those that participate, for purification of soul, forgiveness of sins";[20] after the Lord's Prayer, "make us worthy to partake . . . for the remission of sins, forgiveness of transgressions";[21] and the Words of Administration are: "N. the servant of God is made partaker of the pure and holy body and blood of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ, for the remission of his sins, and life everlasting."[22] After the Words of Institution in the Nestorian Liturgy, the priest prays, "That I and these may be accounted worthy of the pardon of offences and the remission of sins through this holy body which we are receiving in the belief of the truth by the grace which is of thee".[23] The prayer of the veil in the Liturgy of the Syrian Jacobites reads: "That this mystery which is administered for our redemption be not for judgement unto thy people but for the wiping out of sins and for forgiveness of trespasses."[24]

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC LIBRARY

The same teaching is to be noted in the liturgies of the West. In the Roman rite, after the *Confiteor*, the celebrant turns to the communicants, holding a particle of the host between his thumb and forefinger, and declares: "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world."[25] In the prayer of ablutions he prays: "Grant that no stain of sin may remain in me, who have been fed with pure and holy sacraments."[26] The corresponding prayer in the Sarum Use begins with the words: "May this communion, O Lord, purge us from sin."[27] The post-communion prayer in the Gallican rite reads: "We humbly implore thy mercy that this sacrament . . . may be a cleansing of sins."[28] The prayer of the commixture in the Mozarabic rite includes the petition: "May it be to us that receive it and drink it for pardon."[29]

It is difficult to deny in the face of this evidence, which is no more than a selection of the material available, that according to the New Testament, the Fathers, and the early and medieval liturgies, the Eucharist does convey the remission of sins. It may however be asked whether or not it is also a part of Anglican teaching. To many this will seem an irrelevant question, for whatever the Reformers and the Anglican divines who succeeded them may or may not have said, they are not the touchstone of Christian belief, which must have its roots in the Bible and the Fathers. Nevertheless the question may stand, and it is easily answerable in the affirmative. In the 1549 rite, the prayer before the Lord's prayer, and before communion, contains the petition that "we and all thy whole church may obtain remission of sins, and all other benefits of his passion"; while the prayer of humble access, immediately before communion, requests that "our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood". The transference of the first of these, in the form of the prayer of oblation, to a position after communion, in the 1552 rite, does not effect its essential meaning. But that the eucharistic forgiveness of sins is a part of Anglican sacramental theology is made abundantly clear in the writings of Daniel Waterland. Indeed so representative of Anglican teaching was Waterland's exposition considered to be that the section of his work devoted to the Eucharist was published in a single volume in 1868 by the Clarendon Press "at the request of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York", and in the preface by the Bishop of Lincoln it is stated that the book "is a safe and perspicuous guide to

those tenets on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper which, as a matter of fact, have been held by the great majority of the ablest and most learned Theologians of the Reformed Church of England".[30] Chapter IX of this book is entitled "Remission of Sins conferred in the Eucharist", and the headings of the subsections read: "Proved from Scripture; From Antiquity; Judgment of the Reformers, and of the Church of England; Objections Removed." Covering much of the same ground as this article so far, Waterland asserted that in so far as we partake of the sacramental blood in the Eucharist we do so unto remission of sins, and he stated that: "If we are therein partakers of Christ's death, with the fruits thereof; and if the atonement be one of those fruits, and indeed the first and principal; and if remission follows the atonement, where it is truly applied; it is manifest from these considerations taken together, that remission is conferred, or (which comes to the same) renewed and confirmed, in the Sacrament of the Eucharist. This argument is built upon a very clear and allowed maxim, that the effect must answer to the cause, and the fruits to the stock from whence they grow."[31] Since, we may add, the Eucharist unites us with Christ and brings us into his presence, our sin is cast out.

Granted then that the Eucharist does confer the remission of sins, what are we to make of Canon Sansbury's antithesis?— " 'Where shall our main emphasis be?' On our coming as sinners seeking forgiveness as well as other gifts in communion? Or on our coming as already forgiven sinners to offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and to receive what is supremely a gift of life and strength and incorporation into Christ and his Body?"[32] Apart from the fact that the Eucharist is too rich in meaning to allow the placing of emphasis upon any one single aspect, I would suggest that this is a false antithesis which dissolves the eschatological tension at the heart of Christian life and fails to take account of the intimate relationship of Baptism and the Eucharist. The inaugurated eschatology of the New Testament presents the Christian with the moral and spiritual task of becoming what he is. This double polarity is of the essence of Christian living; there is a tension between the present blessings and the final consummation; between the kingdom as a present reality and its complete realization at the end of all things; between the Christian as a forgiven sinner through Baptism and yet in need of continual forgiveness

through the Eucharist. We come to communion *both* as already forgiven sinners *and* as sinners seeking forgiveness.

It is important at this juncture to recognize the unity of the Gospel Sacraments, which must be understood in their interrelationship and totality if their meaning is to be made clear—here indeed are the twin poles of Christian experience. Just as the Baptism of Jesus was proleptic and signified the whole of his mission, pointing forward to the cross, so that the entire saving ministry of Christ was summed up in that one act in Jordan and yet had to be realized and revealed by what was to follow, so the Baptism of the individual believer sums up in one moment the whole course of his life which is to be realized in all that follows, and this actualization is achieved primarily through the Eucharist. This actualization, if I may here refer to a discussion printed elsewhere,[33] may be summarized under seven heads: 1. Baptism is spiritual circumcision by means of which the individual is brought into the Covenant, and the Eucharist is the sacrificial meal by means of which the covenant-relationship is renewed. 2. Baptism unites the believer with Christ in his death and the Eucharist likewise. 3. Baptism conveys the remission of sins and the Eucharist likewise. 4. Baptism is the means of adoption and the Eucharist is the means of participation in the Sonship of Christ. 5. Baptism is the means of regeneration and the Eucharist is the means of providing sustenance for those who have undergone this rebirth. 6. Baptism is the means of drawing the individual out of isolation into unity, and the Eucharist is the means of intensifying that unity. 7. Through Baptism the divine image is restored and through the Eucharist the process of formation is continued. The third of these headings, all of which emphasize the unity of Baptism and the Eucharist and their relation to the necessary continuing tension of Christian life so that we may become what we are, summarizes the thesis of this article so far.

The question still remains: even if the Eucharist does confer the remission of sins, progressively actualizing the baptismal remission, does this necessarily involve the exclusion of a confession and an absolution from the Eucharist? These two elements—confession and absolution—are of course separable, it being possible to have the former without the latter, to which consideration must first be given.

Absolution, in the sense of an authoritative declaration and conveyance of the divine pardon, should be omitted from the Eucharist because, at whatever point it may come, it is an unnecessary anticipation of the effects of the rite as a whole. The average worshipper can scarcely be expected to appreciate the meaning of the Eucharist in all its varied aspects, and its intimate relation with his Baptism, if one of its effects is thus manifestly reduplicated by absolution. It is further to be noted that there was no absolution in the primitive liturgies, that in many of those in use in the East to this day there is still no absolution, and that its insertion in the West was the outcome of late medieval devotional practices of doubtful value. Finally an absolution is to be deprecated on the grounds that its use in the Eucharist conflicts with the doctrine of penance formulated in the early Church. While to the Fathers of the second, third, and fourth centuries public penance and reconciliation were necessary for scandalous sins, forgiveness for the ordinary shortcomings and failings of everyday life was secured by private prayer and almsgiving[34] and the Eucharist. To regard an absolution after a *general* confession as a necessary element in the Eucharist is to advocate a *praxis* of which the Fathers were ignorant, which they would have considered entirely unnecessary and which they would not have been able to justify on doctrinal grounds.

All this is not to say that a *confession* should be omitted. Although this too, like the absolution, was a comparatively late insertion in the Eucharist, that is insufficient grounds for rejecting it—to do so would be to indulge in archaism. Its inclusion was undoubtedly the product of a strong psychological factor, namely the worshipper's sense of unworthiness in the presence of God. This psychological factor remains unchanged and is as potent as ever. The worshipper does feel the need to acknowledge that he is not fit to come before God. Like Isaiah in the temple, he wants to cry out: "Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips" (6. 5). Like Peter in the boat, he is even constrained to declare: "Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord" (Luke 5. 8). Accordingly a confession should be provided, followed however, if the cogency of my argument be accepted, not by an absolution but by a prayer for forgiveness in the confident hope that that forgiveness will be renewed and confirmed in communion.

1 C. K. Sansbury, "Revising the Liturgy", *C.Q.R.*, CLXI, 1960, pp. 163-74.
2 Ibid., p. 167.
3 I have already touched upon it in *The Spirit, The Church and The Sacraments*, 1954, pp. 128f; *An Experimental Liturgy*, 1958, pp. 22ff.
4 Cp. "The Mysterium is a holy, cultic action in which the redemptive act is rendered present in the rite; since the cultic community accomplishes this rite, it participates in the saving act and through it attains redemption." Dom O. Cassel, quoted by E. B. Koenker, *The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church*, 1954, p. 106.
5 If Culmann's suggestive thesis were accepted, to the effect that the miracles in St John are intended to show the relationship between the historic Christ and the Gospel Sacraments, further evidence could be adduced, e.g., the miracle at Cana, as interpreted by Cullmann, shows that the wine of the Eucharist has replaced the water of Jewish purification and that this wine now effects purification from sin because it is the blood of Christ (*Early Christian Worship*, 1953, p. 70), or the *pedilavium*, which teaches that "for sins committed after Baptism the disciples should go on celebrating the Eucharist" (Ibid., p. 109)).
6 "Theology of the New Testament", *E.T.*, I, 1952, p. 146.
7 M. Thurian, *L'Eucharistie*, 1959, p. 196.
8 Ibid., p. 198.
9 Ibid., p. 207.
10 Fragment on Prov. ix. 1 (*P.G.* 10. 625, 628).
11 *Ep.* 63. 11.
12 Ap. Eusebius, *H.E.*, vi. 44.
13 *De Sacramen.*, 4. 28.
14 Ibid., 5. 17.
15 Ibid., 4. 24.
16 Ibid., 5. 25.
17 2. 33.
18 8. 12.
19 F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, 1896, p. 373.
20 Ibid., p. 387.
21 Ibid., p. 390.
22 Ibid., p. 396.
23 Ibid., p. 286.
24 Ibid., p. 84.
25 R. C. West, *Western Liturgies*, 1938, p. 31.
26 Ibid., loc. cit.
27 Ibid., p. 103.
28 Ibid., p. 53.
29 Ibid., p. 68.
30 *A Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, 1868, p. vii.
31 Ibid., p. 218.
32 Art. cit. pp. 167f.
33 *The Spirit, The Church and The Sacraments*, pp. 123-44.
34 For the rationale of private penance and its relation to the Gospel Sacraments see ibid., pp. 195-203.

THE BREAD OF THE EUCHARIST

C. E. POCKNEE

When the second phase of the Oxford Movement began after 1845, there began also an increasing tendency to assimilate somewhat uncritically into the Church of England some of the customs that had been laid aside since the time of the First English Prayer Book of 1549. The leaders of the Oxford Movement, or the catholic revival as it now came to be known, often confused what was merely Latin and medieval with what was catholic and primitive. Thus they failed to perceive that a High Mass according to the late medieval rite of Sarum, as carried out at Salisbury in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries differed considerably in its ceremonial and doctrinal emphasis from the pontifical liturgy that was still in evidence at Rome as late as the eleventh century.[1] Nor were the advocates of the full "Western" Use who derided the Sarum Use as "British Museum" in any better case since they were advocating the ceremonial of the Pian Missal issued after the Council of Trent (1570). Both the Sarum and post-Tridentine Missals contained much that was unknown to the Church in the West during the first millenium of the Christian era.

It has been the task of liturgical and biblical studies during the past half century to clear away the accretions that have overlaid Christian worship since the second part of the middle ages.

The re-introduction of wafer bread into the Church of England since 1845 corresponds to some extent with the re-introduction of the late medieval ceremony of the elevation of the Host. An eminent Roman Catholic scholar of our own day has described this elevation in the following terms: "An alien element brought into the Mass, which had the effect of beclouding the true significance of the holy sacrifice. . . . and thereby the spiritual energies of the faithful were, in the course of centuries, turned away from the Sacrifice itself."[2] What has been stated in regard to the elevation of the Host applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to the re-introduction of individual wafer breads. The argument that Christ and the disciples used unleavened bread at the Last Supper cannot be proved since none of the writers of the New Testament states that unleavened bread was used on that occasion. Without exception Matt. 26. 26; Mark 14. 22; Luke 22. 19; 1 Cor. 11. 23 all employ the term ἄρτος, to describe the bread used at the first Eucharist. If the writers of

the Gospels and St Paul had been at pains to underline the fact that unleavened bread was used they would have used ἄζυμος, corresponding to the Hebrew *mâzzoth*.[3]

It has, however, been argued recently by Professor Jeremias[4] that the term ἄρτος in Mark 14. 22 and in the other passages to which we have referred , could imply the use of unleavened bread since the term ἄρτος is so used in the LXX to describe unleavened bread. In support of his contentions Dr Jeremias quotes the following passages in the Septuagint. Ex. 29. 2; Lev. 2. 4; 8. 25; Num. 6. 15, 19; Deut. 16. 3. But an examination of these passages will show that in every instance cited it is not simply the term ἄρτος which is used to describe unleavened bread, but ἄρτος ἄζυμος or ἄρτοι ἄζυμοι as the case may be. This argument must, therefore be considered more disingenuous than convincing.

The use of the term ἄρτος without qualification by the writers of the New Testament shows us that they attached no significance to the kind of bread that was used at the Eucharist. When we pass outside the canonical scriptures to the patristic period there seems to be nothing which suggests that the Church Fathers attached any significance to the use of unleavened bread at the Eucharist. St Augustine[5] makes great play upon the words of St Paul in 1 Cor. 10. 17, "We being many are one loaf, one body", which shows us that the North African Church could not have used unleavened bread at that time, as became the custom in the West in the later middle ages.

Both literary accounts as well as pictorial representations in the West show us that for many centuries the bread used at the Mass did not vary from that used in the household. The only distinction, if distinction it can be called, was that the best and finest formed loaves were selected for use at the liturgy. St Ambrose shows clearly that the bread used at the Eucharist was the ordinary bread, since he says, "Thou sayest 'My bread is of the usual kind' [*meus panis est usitatus*]. But that bread is bread before the words of the sacraments; when consecration has been added it becomes the flesh of Christ."[6]

As we know it was the custom in many places for the people to bring and present their own bread at the time of the offertory. These loaves were sometimes in the form of a chaplet or crown; and the consecrated bread is in more than one instance termed *corona*. In the ninth-century *Ordo* of St Amand[7] we find the term

corona still in use to describe the consecrated element. Pictorial evidence shows that the breads used were sometimes in the form of the *coronae* we have described, or in the form of a small loaf about four inches across. A number of examples may be seen in the mosaics at Ravenna belonging to the sixth century.[8] St Gregory the Great also tells us about a priest to whom someone wanted to give *duas oblationem coronas,* which are thereafter termed *panis sanctus.*[9]

An eleventh-century frescoe in the lower church of San Clemente, Rome shows an offertory procession in which the breads are still in the form of *coronae; and* it is now evident that leavened bread continued to be used at Rome as late as the eleventh century. The use of the term *fermentum,* meaning leavened, in connection with the Mass at Rome is found in the ninth century *Ordo* II to describe the consecrated particle dropped into the chalice at the *commixtio.*[10]

In the Churches of the East leavened bread has been the normal custom,[11] with the exception of the Armenians and the Maronites. When the Armenians first came to use unleavened bread seems impossible to determine.[12] In the case of the Maronites the use of wafer bread appears to have begun in the thirteenth century.[13] But as this rite is considerably latinized this is not surprising, since the entire Maronite Church accepts the primacy and authority of Rome.

In the West the demand for the use of unleavened bread appears first in the ninth century, and that in the northern countries amongst such writers as Rhabanus Maurus (*d.* 856) [14] and Alcuin (*d.* 804).[15] About the same time the custom of placing the Sacrament directly on the tongue of the communicant begins to appear; and this may not be unconnected with the use of wafer bread, since unlike the pieces of leavened bread the thin particles readily adhered to the tongue. But as we have already pointed out the use of unleavened bread continued in the West in places until the eleventh century.

The introduction of the ceremony of the elevation of the Host at the end of the twelfth century made wafer bread almost inevitable; since the essence of the elevation was the ability of the people to "see God" when the Sacrament was elevated.

The liturgical renaissance that is now taking place in the Roman Catholic Communion is advocating a return to the use of larger

breads, so that there may be a real "fractio panis" at the time of the people's Communion as was the ancient custom in the Roman rite.[16]

1 W. H. Frere, *The Principles of Religious Ceremonial* (new ed., 1929), pp. 59-91.
2 P. Parsch, *The Liturgy of the Mass* (St Louis, Mo., 1936), p. 235.
3 W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, p. 182.
4 J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (1955), pp. 38-41.
5 *Sermone*, 272.
6 *De Sacramentis*, liber 4, 4.
7 M. Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen age* (Louvain, 1948), Vol. II, p. 164.
8 F. Van de Meer and C. Mohrmann, *Atlas of the Early Christian World*, pp. 446-7, also Cabrol and Lerclercq, *Dictionaire D'Archéologie*, Vol. III, pp. 2476-7.
9 Migne, *Pat. Latina*, pp. 77, 417.
10 M. Andrieu, op. cit., p. 115.
11 J. M. Hanssens, *Institutiones Liturgicae* (Rome, 1932), Vol. II, pp. 121-217.
12 A. A. King, *Rites of Eastern Christendom* (Rome, 1948), Vol. II, pp. 585-6.
13 A. A. King, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 250.
14 Migne, *Pat. Latina*, 107, 318.
15 Op. cit., pp. 100, 289.
16 M. Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani*, vol. II, p. 100

LECTURERS AND LECTURESHIPS IN TUDOR LONDON

H. GARETH OWEN

THE SIXTEENTH century witnessed the emergence of a new category of clergy, the parish lecturer, " . . . a new body severed from the ancient clergy of England, as being neither parsons, vicars or curates".[1] Primarily an urban manifestation, it owed its existence to an intensified demand for the Word in a protestant society. The lecturer sprang up spontaneously on the parochial level, and developed independently of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. He was the product of an articulate and devout laity,[2] and in the merchant class of London he found his principal patron.[3]

Development and Distribution

Pre-reformation precedents for the parish lectureship are elusive: the only kindred models in London were the cathedral foundation at St Paul's, in existence since the thirteenth century,[4] and the endowment established at Whittington college in 1508.[5]

Not until the Edwardian period did the system begin to percolate to the parishes. Sermonophile citizens, influenced by their clergy's emphasis on preaching as the principal medium of salvation, set up lecturing positions in at least three parishes,[6] while at St Paul's, two preachers read lectures four days a week in 1549. John Hooper, recently returned from Zurich, was the foremost exponent of the radical lecture; twice daily, he preached to " . . . so numerous an audience that the church cannot contain them".[7]

Martyrdom, imprisonment, or exile, deprived Marian London of many of the leading preachers of the previous reign,[8] and the lectureship system, it appears, fell into temporary abeyance.[9] Elizabeth's accession heralded an early revival, engineered mainly by the returning emigrés from the continent. In high favour with both the episcopal authorities and the citizenry, they infiltrated into the choicest livings left vacant on the Elizabethan Settlement. Former exiles dominated City pulpits in the early days of the reign, exerting a monopoly made easier by the dearth of preachers among the clergy who had survived the Marian reaction.[10]

The parish lectureship thus re-assumed its reformist character of the Edwardian period. The Genevan influence was most apparent

at St Antholin, rapidly becoming the focal point of nonconformist resistance to the Anglican settlement. There, congregational psalm-singing preceded the early morning lectures read by a trio of preachers described by Stow as the " . . . moaste ernyste withstondars of ye lawes of this realme . . . consernynge ye ordar of mynystracions, and ye greatyst animators of all ye wholl citie to do the lyke . . .".[11] Elsewhere. lectureships became the platform for preachers vociferous in their defiance of the vestiarian regulations prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer.[12]

Their combined activities precipitated the vestiarian controversy of 1565-6, provoking Parker and Grindal into a belated policy of repression. Thirty-seven London ministers were suspended for declining to subscribe to the order prescribed in the Prayer Book and to wear " . . . the schollers Gown/and capp/[and] the syrplys at all sarvyes".[13] The nucleus of preachers in lecturing positions was deeply involved; according to one indignant citizen, Parker's action meant the " . . . utter overthrow . . . of all exercises almost of interpretation of the scripture used every morning and evening in sundry churches within this City".[14] Economic necessity brought an early end to this mass defiance, but lecturers were prominent among the dozen who, three months later, were still prepared ". . . to suffer at man's hand whatsoever punishments man's law do appoint", and consequently forfeited their preferments.[15]

The effect on the development of parochial lectureships was profound. The virtual monoply enjoyed by a small group of radical preachers was shattered: no longer was the lectureship the exclusive preserve of the nonconformist wing of the Church. Vacancies were often filled by young graduates of impeccable orthodoxy brought into the City incumbencies by Parker and Grindal as a stabilizing influence.[16] Able preachers, they met to a certain degree the popular demand for sermons which hitherto only the nonconformist element had satisfied.

Stimulated by this infusion, the academic and preaching standards of the London clergy rapidly improved. Bishops observed greater discrimination at ordination ceremonies:[17] ecclesiastical patrons, who controlled the majority of London benefices, made more careful presentations:[18] increasing numbers of university men looked towards London for patronage and preferment.[19] The result was a steep rise in the proportion of graduate incumbents after 1570.[20]

This trend was reflected in as swift an increase in the number of lectureships. Parker's purge of 1566 had made the office respectable; the next twenty years made it fashionable. By 1583, thirty parish lectureships are known to have been in existence, more than four times the number in 1566, and almost twice that of 1577. By 1589, the total was thirty-three; this proved the approximate ceiling point during the remainder of the reign. At this time, then, almost one-third of all the London parishes were voluntarily supporting extra Sunday and weekday sermons. At various dates during the period, indeed, one out of every two parishes established a lecturing position.[12]

Lectureships were heavily distributed among parishes lacking a resident or preaching incumbent. In at least three of the seven parishes known to employ lecturers in 1566, the incumbent was either non-resident or a non-preacher. By 1577, six out of a total of seventeen fell within this category. In 1589, the figure was fifteen out of thirty-three; this by 1598 had fallen to eleven out of thirty-five. This was the primary *raison d'être* of the lectureship—an attempt by laymen to remedy preaching deficiencies within the Church—and as such it was supported by Aylmer, bishop during the period of most lecturing expansion in the 1580's.[22]

At the same time, lectureships were rapidly springing up in parishes where the incumbent was both resident and a qualified preacher. In such cases, a lectureship was clearly intended to supplement the existing quota of sermons required by law.[23] The incumbent himself frequently delivered the lectures, securing for himself a valuable means of augmenting his normal income.[24]

Not every parish, however, was prepared to employ the incumbent as lecturer. Eight vestries in 1583 employed an outsider, although the parson was a suitably qualified person; in 1598, four followed a similar course.[25] Such discrimination aroused a natural resentment among the beneficed clergy, provoking incidents between incumbents and lecturers that foreshadowed the rift which emerged between the two classes in the early Stuart period.[26]

The outsider, whether employed by a parish with or without a preaching or resident incumbent, was a distinctive figure in Elizabethan London. Until the middle of the reign, the majority of lectureships were occupied by such men; in 1583, as many as twenty-three were dispersed among the City parishes. Subsequently,

the number fell slightly, as incumbents—and even an occasional well-qualified assistant curate[27]—secured the positions, but as late as 1598, outsiders occupied almost half the total.[28] A minority held a living or curacy elsewhere;[29] the remainder were unattached, occupied exclusively with preaching, " . . . a kind of popular freelance, exempt from parochial cares and parochial ministration".[30]

The unattached lecturer, a category not recognized by canon law, was until 1580 immune from its jurisdiction so long as he possessed the prescribed clerical and preaching instruments.[31] He was not required to subscribe or to obtain the sanction of the diocesan ordinary before taking up his post: before 1583, he did not attend the episcopal visitation.[32] Nonconformists found in a lectureship a refuge that enabled them freely to advocate reform from a position within the Church. Clerical Puritanism in London, recovering from its eclipse of 1566, persistently exploited this loophole, and the lectureship became the principal public platform of members of the first presbyterian classis in the City.[33]

Belatedly, the ecclesiastical authorities challenged and undermined this immunity during Aylmer's episcopate. He, it was said,[34] was principally responsible for the Privy Council order of 1580 requiring all ministers to assist periodically in administering Holy Communion in the church at which they preached.[35] Nonconformists could no longer avoid using the Book of Common Prayer against which they held such objection. In the same year, Aylmer inquired about the number of unbeneficed lecturers in the archdeaconry of London, and warned outsiders not to interfere in parishes where the incumbent was a preacher.[36] In 1583, all unattached lecturers were for the first time cited to the episcopal visitation, where their credentials and conformability were checked.[37] This was followed by Whitgift's articles of subscription, requiring all preachers, beneficed or otherwise, to comply with certain propositions, including obedience to all forms of service prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer.[38] With the vigorous application of these various orders, Puritan resistance crumbled; few of the leading nonconformists still held their lecturing positions by 1590.[39] The number of unattached lecturers declined, and was largely composed of young ministers profitably engaged whilst anticipating beneficed preferment.[40]

Conditions of Employment

Fairly typical was the appointment made at St Christopher-le-Stocks in 1577.[41] At a vestry meeting, ". . . Request was maid that ther might be some learned man apoynted to Read a lecter in this parishe twise a weke and for the mayntenaunce ther of A collection should be made of the benevolence of the parisheners . . . " A church-warden and a sidesman were deputed to " . . . travall with the parishners and to sett downe in writting what everyman is willing of his owen benevolence to geve yerly . . . ". The response was favourable, and at the following vestry meeting, the wardens, in conjunction with a prominent lawyer who resided in the parish,[42] were instructed to appoint a lecturer for six months, paying him " . . . as to them shalbe thought convenyent".

The establishment of a lectureship, it can be seen, was a vestry decision; it was made independently of the incumbent who did not even attend the meetings.[43] The actual choice in this parish was left to a group of officials, and gave them a useful source of clerical patronage. Elsewhere, more democratic variations existed: candidates at St Botolph Aldgate preached "trial" sermons before a decision was made by the vestry as a whole,[44] while at St Margaret, New Fish Street, where two applied for the post in 1582, the issue was decided by vote. Congregational election of this kind was doubtless some compensation to parishioners deprived by the patronage system of a voice in the appointment of their incumbents.[45]

Vestries insisted upon the selection of a "learned" man. The usual criterion was the possession of a university degree: only if he were also the incumbent of the living, did a non-graduate stand a chance of a lectureship after 1570.[46] Occasionally, conditions were even more stringent; the Puritan vestry of St Olave Southwark laid down that applicants should be both resident in the parish and unmarried.[47] The shrewder candidates brought with them testimonials from an influential citizen or a popular divine, but not even the archbishop's recommendation could waive the need to win a majority vote " . . . of the moste and beste of parishioners hands".[48] Prudence drove a few parishes to seek episcopal sanction —certainly not required by law—before engaging a lecturer.[49]

Appointments were usually made on an annual basis and renewed accordingly. This served to protect both the parish, which so frequently depended upon the whims of parishioners for the main-

tenance of the lectureship, and the preacher, to whom such a post was often no more than a stepping-stone to beneficed employment. Some parishes inserted a three or six month notice of dismissal.[50] Even so, a lecturer's position was highly vulnerable, at the disposal of vestrymen against whom he had no right of appeal. The parishioners of Christ Church, Newgate Street, were notoriously fickle in this respect. The lecturer in 1571 was dismissed " . . . for lack of attendans ther and also for that [he] in his teaching Doth not edyfie the people". Two of his successors were said to be " . . . not learned, nor pleaseth the Audytorye which will be the cause that the Auditorye wyll decaye if that there by not better learned men placed". On investigation, the only specific complaint found against one of the preachers was that his " . . . voyce is Lowe", and he was reprieved.[51]

A lecturer's duties varied considerably from parish to parish. He might be expected to preach four times a week,[52] but the average was twice—once on Sunday and once in mid-week. Where an outsider was employed, the parson sometimes objected to surrendering his own Sunday tenure of the pulpit; at St Margaret Lothbury, for instance, the rector gave leave " . . . for another to Reed or preache any daie or daies that they woulde apoynt, Reserving sondie to himselfe".[53]

In many parishes, the lecturer was required to give instruction in the catechism, a task otherwise performed by the incumbent or curate.[54] This function was variously interpreted: the more radical preachers, instead of limiting themselves to interrogating the youth of the parish as laid down in episcopal regulations, expounded on a text before a congregation composed of adults as well as adolescents.[55] A catechizing service of this kind was in fact a synonym for a lecture, and as such was more popular with the parishioners than the diocesan authorities.[56]

In practice, a lecturer's activities ranged far wider than was specified in the terms of his appointment. If an outsider, he was committed by a privy council order of 1580 to participate periodically in administering the Holy Communion at the church in which he preached.[57] Puritan ministers, against whose exclusively preaching activities the order was directed, found this an intolerable condition, but to the conformist it was only one of several ways in which he assisted the incumbent. He ministered in his illness or absence at a Sunday service, or at a marriage, baptism, or funeral. If

the incumbent were a non-preacher, the lecturer was most likely to deliver the statutory quarterly sermons within the parish. At St Botolph Aldgate, the lecturer preached almost as many funeral or commemorative sermons as lectures between 1587 and 1594.[58]

Maintenance

A lectureship was financed either by an endowment or by parochial contributions. Endowments, by far the more stable type, existed only in a few parishes, and were generally derived from the legacies of citizens.

Part of the £300 left in trust to his company by John Heydon, mercer, was directed towards the maintenance of a weekly lecture at St Michael Paternoster Row.[59] Sir Wolstan Dixie, one-time lord mayor, left a £10 annuity to the Skinners' Company for the maintenance of a bi-weekly lecture in a City church.[60] The most heavily-endowed parish was the original nonconformist centre, St Antholin, which drew on income from its "lecturers' estates" as well as from legacies for the payment of the three lecturers employed there during most of Elizabeth's reign.[61] A more specific forerunner of a sectarian endowment occurred in the terms of a legacy of £100 made in 1598 by Thomas Ridge, citizen and grocer, for the maintenance of a lectureship in the parish of St Benet Gracechurch Street. The preacher was to be appointed by the overseers of the will ". . . otherwise this gift to be voyde". All four overseers were prominent nonconformist preachers; clearly, the legacy had the disguised intent of providing a stable pulpit for a Puritan minister.[62]

Endowments grew more fashionable in the Jacobean age. Wealthy citizens found in such a practice an opportunity to commemorate their own piety, and, by attaching conditions of residence and academic qualifications to their charities, to effect an improvement in pastoral standards.[63] As the number of stable, endowed lectureships increased, so did the security of the lecturer; thus was created the condition for the emergence of a powerful class of independent lecturers in London.

The City corporation, in contrast to the enterprise shown by some municipal authorities outside London,[64] did little to encourage the growth of lectureships in the sixteenth century, and not until 1623 were any funds diverted to such purposes.[65] In 1581, in fact, it successfully resisted a project devised by the Privy Council and backed by Aylmer, the bishop of London, for the establishment of

bi-weekly lectures in "every convenient division" of the City. In his objections to the scheme, the lord mayor argued that the parishes and inns of courts were already well-equipped with lecturing positions.[66] Drawn-out negotiations followed, but the "might of Mammon", in Aylmer's words, prevailed, and the plan was abandoned.[67]

The great majority of lectureships existed precariously on voluntary parochial contributions, assessments being made in accordance with the rate for the parish clerk's wages.[68] In the Minories, funds were collected after the Sunday sermon.[69] Occasionally, support came from individuals outside the parish,[70] and at least one instance existed of a grant from one parish for the maintenance of a lecturer in another, a rare case of inter-parochial co-operation.[71]

A few parishes ventured to impose compulsory contributions on all householders, based on the rental value of a house or on pew-rents. Such a course was adopted at St Bartholomew Exchange after an unsuccessful appeal for voluntary contributions.[72] In Stepney, a pew-rent accounted for two-thirds of the total; the remainder was donated by the rector.[73]

Parochial offerings, compulsory or voluntary, seldom reached the total needed to cover the lecturer's salary and other miscellaneous expenses.[74] Deficits could be made up from any surplus money collected for the clerk's wages, [75] but were generally met by grants from the parish stock.[76] Such subsidies imposed a heavy strain upon the finances of less wealthy parishes, and on occasion obliged church-wardens to cut their losses and abandon the lectureship until enthusiasm revived.[77]

The most stable of the endowed lectureships were those set up in the few parishes where the impropriate rectory had fallen, either by purchase or by lease, into the hands of the parishioners. Tithe revenue, that in an orthodox type of living was conveyed to the incumbent, could in these cases be partially diverted towards the maintenance of a preacher. Parishioners, relieved of an obligation to find money for a lecturer as well as to pay tithes, were more liberal with their salaries. At St Lawrence Jewry, the parish bought a lease of the impropriation in 1587; within six years, the preacher's stipend had doubled.[78]

The £40 a year paid in this parish to the lecturer in 1604 was the highest known in contemporary London.[79] Preachers in less wealthy impropriate livings earned between £10 and £20,[80] wages that

compared favourably with those in more orthodox types of benefices. There, much depended upon the appeal of a particular minister; the more popular the preacher, the greater the parochial "goodwill", and the larger the reward. The Puritan divine, Thomas Crooke, received £20 a year for one weekly lecture at St Mary Woolchurch [81] in the 1580's; his contemporary at St Margaret, New Fish Street, received £6 13s. 4d. for identical services.[82] Nicholas Alsop, a popular itinerant preacher at the turn of the century, earned £20 at St Mary Woolnoth, his immediate predecessor £10.[83] A highly prized position was that at St Botolph Aldgate where six applicants competed for a £30 salary in 1596.[84]

William Harrison, himself a London minister, considered £30 a year a living wage for a beneficed clergyman at the end of the sixteenth century.[85] A capable preacher, particularly one of radical views, could aspire to earn this sum from a single lecturing post.[86] Moreover, such a position could be held in plurality or in conjunction with a cure of souls elsewhere,[87] and was free from the crippling taxes exacted from a beneficed clergyman.[88] It is not surprising that Nicholas Alsop—by no means an isolated example—with his trio of City lectureships in the 1590s, did not hasten to assume the responsibilities of beneficed preferment.[89]

The most dramatic expression of lay piety in the Elizabethan period, the parish lectureship re-vitalized ecclesiastical activity in the capital. The principal clerical beneficiary was the incumbent who lectured in his own or a neighbouring parish, for he was least dependent upon the system. He could enjoy the augmentation (untaxed) it offered to his income without suffering excessively from its insecurity. Weekday lectures affected pastoral standards, encouraging residence, and more conscientious preparation of sermons.[90] Greater pastoral diligence improved relationships within the parish; moreover, less dependence on tithes meant less insistence on securing tithes, in itself a practical aid to parochial harmony.

The unattached lecturer, holding no official ecclesiastical office, stood to gain and to lose most from the system. To the ambitious young graduate, a lectureship constituted a temporary position—more lucrative than its alternatives, a curacy or teaching post—in which to win contacts, gain a patron, and, above all, to establish a preaching reputation. To the unbeneficed nonconformist, a lecturing post afforded his only effective link with the established

Church, the only opportunity to preach reform from a position within the parochial framework. Both types, however, suffered from the tenurial insecurity of the system: no safeguard existed against, on the other hand, the intervention of ecclesiastical authority in the later years of the century, and, on the other, the whims of parishioners who appointed and financed them. Even an endowed lectureship was seldom completely independent of parochial contributions,[91] a fluctuating source relying on an enthusiasm that rarely endured. Not until their positions were bolstered by substantial, self-sufficient endowments could unattached parish lecturers form a powerful class that seriously threatened the ranks of the beneficed clergy.

[1] This was the description given by James I in his Directions concerning Preachers 1622 (*Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, ed. H. Gee and W. J. Hardy, London, 1896, p. 518). The chief MS. sources for this study have been the parochial vestry minutes and church-wardens' accounts, and the visitation call books of the bishops of London.

[2] "Thanks to countless manuals", wrote L. B. Wright in his *Middle Class Culture in Elizabethan England*, London, 1935, "the private citizen had become articulate in the presence of the Deity", p. 241.

[3] W. K. Jordan, *Philanthropy in England 1480-1660*, London, 1959, pp. 148-9, 236-8.

[4] W. S. Simpson, *Chapters in the History of Old S. Paul's*, London, 1881, p. 48.

[5] *City of London Livery Companies Commission*, London, 1884, ii. pp. 680, 697.

[6] Guildhall Library MS.—subsequently cited as GLMS.—1568, p. 34; 4071/1, f. 34v.; 4956/2, f. 47r.

[7] *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation*, ed. H. Robinson, Parker Soc., Cambridge, 1846, i. p. 65; M. M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, Chicago, 1939, p. 82.

[8] *The Victoria History*, London, ed. W. Page, London, 1909, i. pp. 298-303; E. L. C. Mullins, "The Effects of the Marian and Elizabethan Religious Settlements Upon the Clergy of London, 1553-1564" (Unpublished M.A. thesis, London, 1948), pp. 122-32.

[9] An exception was the endowed position at Whittington College (*The Diary of Henry Machyn*, ed. J. G. Nichols, Camden Soc., London, 1874, p. 91).

[10] By 1561, eight incumbents and four assistant curates in London parishes were former exiles. The bishop, archdeacon, and two of the ecclesiastical judges with authority in London, had also been abroad in Mary's reign. (See the writer's unpublished London Ph.D. thesis (1957), "The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I", pp. 150-1, 475).

[11] *Three Fifteenth-Century Chronicles*, ed. J. Gairdner, Camden Soc., London, 1880, p. 139; *The Diary of Henry Machyn*, loc. cit., 212.

[12] Of the nine preachers known to have occupied lecturing positions before 1566, at least six—Robert Crowley, John Gough, John Philpot, Thomas Greshopp, Richard Allen, and John Bartlett—were nonconformists who suffered in the vestiarian dispute of 1565-6.

[13] Thomas Earl's notebook (Cambridge Univ. Lib. MS., Mm, 1, 29, f. 3r.). Earl was himself one of the non-subscribers. For an account of this controversy, see R. W. Dixon, *History of the Church of England*, Oxford, 1902, vol. vi. passim.

[14] Herts. Rec. Office, Gorhambury MS. viii/B/143, ff. 13v.-14v. The citizen was Thomas Wood, a merchant and Marian exile. (Christine H. Garrett, *The Marian Exiles 1553-9*, Cambridge, 1936, p. 343.)

[15] These were the defiant words of Robert Crowley, printed in his *A Brief discourse against the outward apparrell* (1566), Sig. Biii, f1v. Crowley, John Philpot, John Gough, Richard Allen, and Bartlett all lost their lecturing position.

[16] E.g. William Gravett at St Sepulchre; John Young at St Magnus; Thomas Mortibois at St Alphage; Bartholomew Busfield at St Christopher-le-Stocks.

[17] See the writer's thesis, pp. 108-115; J. Strype, *Life and Acts of John Aylmer*, Oxford, 1821, pp. 21-2.

[18] Of the one-hundred and eleven livings in London (comprising the City and the three out-parishes of St James Clerkenwell, St Leonard Shoreditch, and St Mary Islington), only forty-nine were in the gift of non-ecclesiastical patrons.

[19] For the increase in the number of clerical recruits from the universities, see E. Caldwell, *Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England*, Oxford, 1844, ii. p. 6.

[20] In 1560, forty-four of the ninety-four London incumbents were graduates. By 1577, the total was fifty-five out of ninety-seven, and it had reached sixty-nine out of ninety-six in 1595.

[21] Details of the distribution of lectureships among the parishes are given in the writer's thesis, pp. 380-89.

[22] Ibid., 389; B. M. Egerton MS. 1693, f. 103r; Strype, *Aylmer*, p. 57.

[23] Quarterly sermons were compulsory in all parishes. Incumbents who were licensed preachers were required by the 1559 royal injunctions to deliver at least one sermon a month in their own cures. This was increased in London to sixteen a year in 1587. The 1604 canons enjoined authorized preachers, resident in their livings, to preach every Sunday; non-preachers were to procure others to deliver monthly sermons ". . . if the living, in the judgement of the ordinary, will bear it". (Cardwell, op. cit., i. pp. 180-1; Cardwell, *Synodalia*, Oxford, 1842, i. p. 273; W. P. M. Kennedy, *Elizabethan Episcopal Administration*, Alcuin Club, London, 1924, iii. p. 240.)

[24] The incumbent of St Lawrence Pountney, a perpetual curacy, for instance, augmented his stipend of £14 p.a. by a lecturing salary of £20 p.a. (GLMS. 3907/1 [no. fol.])

[25] See the writer's thesis, pp. 389-92.

[26] *HMC, Hatfield MSS.*, xi. 154; B.M., Egerton MS. 1693, f. 103r. Cf. C. Hill, *Economic Problems of the Church*, Oxford, 1956, pp. 278-9.

[27] The first known appointment of an assistant curate as lecturer was that of Hugh Smith in 1584 (GLMS. 4072/1, f. 28r.).

[28] Of thirty-five lectureships known to exist at that date, sixteen were held by outsiders.

[29] E.g. John Fabian, lecturer at St Andrew Holborn in 1589, was also rector of Great Wartley in Essex (*Alumni Cantab.* 1. ii. p. 115).

30 C. Smyth, *Church and Parish: Studies in Church Problems* (1955), p. 113.

31 For a hostile seventeenth-century survey of the activities of freelance lecturers, see P. Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus*, London, 1668, p. 9.

32 GLMS. 9537/3-4. passim.

33 Members of this group are named in *The Presbyterian Movement in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, ed. R. G. Usher, Camden Soc., 3rd Series, viii (1905), xxviii. Thomas Crooke was lecturer at St Mary Woolchurch, Thomas Edmunds at St Margaret New Fish Street and St Mary Woolnoth, George Cheston at All Hallows Staining and St Katherine Coleman St (GLMS. 9535/5 [no. fol.]). John Field and Thomas Barber were at St Mary Aldermary and St Mary-le-Bow respectively (*The Seconde Parte of a Register*, ed. A. Peel, Cambridge, 1915, ii. p. 219).

34 By both John Field and Robert Beale (Camb. Univ. Lib. MS. Mm1, 43, 23, p. 446; B.M., Additional MS. 48039, f. 21r.).

35 Cardwell, *Doc. Annals*, i. pp. 440-1.

36 Kennedy, op. cit., ii. pp. 106-7. B.M., Egerton MS. 1693, f. 103r.

37 GLMS. 9437/5, passim.

38 Knappen, op. cit., p. 267.

39 A notable exception was Stephen Egerton in the Blackfriars. Suspended for a short time in 1584, he subsequently remained undisturbed until 1591 (*D.N.B.*).

40 E.g. Christopher Threlkeld at St Botolph Aldgate and William Brook at St Olave Jewry (GLMS. 9234/2-7 passim; GLMS. 9537/8, f. 81r.).

41 *Parish of St. Christopher Le Stocks and Unpublished Records of the City* of London, ed. E. Freshfield, London, 1886, Vestry Minutes, pp. 7-8.

42 He was Nicholas Fuller, an "intrepid Puritan" (J. E. Neale, *Elizabeth I and her Parliaments 1584-1601*, London, 1957, p. 288).

43 His permission, however, was required for the use of his pulpit by an outsider. A written agreement between rector and wardens about the appointment of an outsider may be seen in GLMS 1568, p. 378.

44 GLMS. 9234/6, f. 97r. At St Olave Southwark, each of the four applicants in 1607 had ". . . to take a text gyven them by [the Rector] and to preache once . . . before their electyon" (Bermondsey Public Lib., Vestry Minutes 1604-1724, f. 8r.).

45 GLMS. 1175/1, [no fol.]. The patron of St Margaret was the Bishop of London.

46 E.g. William Wager, rector of St Benet Gracechurch St. The Puritan lecturer, George Cheston, was a rare exception.

47 Vestry Mins., 1604-1724, f. 5r.

48 St Bart's Hospital MS. Ha. 1/2, f. 229r; Ha 1/3, f. f. 43v. 53v.

49 Ibid., Ha 1/2, f 230v; GLMS. 3570/1, f. 20v.

50 GLMS. 4887, p. 225; St Bart's Hosp. MS. Ha 1/2, f. 72v.

51 Ibid., Ha 1/2, f. f. 72v., 229r., 230v. At St Botolph Aldersgate, dissatisfaction with the perpetual curate led to his being "dischardged the Reading of the Lectour" (GLMS. 1454, No. 81). A dispute between the vicar and vestry of St Lawrence Jewry resulted in the suspension of parochial contributions to the vicar's lecture (GLMS. 4352/1, f. 59r.).

52 This was Thomas Barber's quota at St Mary-le-Bow (*Seconde Parte of a Register*, ii. p. 220.

53 GLMS. 4352/1, f. 65v.

54 GLMS. 4249, f. 235v.; *Memorials of Stepney Parish*, ed. G. W. Hill and W. H. Frere, Guildford, 1890-1, p. 10.

55 The vestry at St Botolph Aldgate instructed its lecturer in 1587 to ". . . Cattechyse to the edifyenge of the people Both yonge and owlde" (GLMS. 9234/1, f. 135r.). Cf. *Endowed Charities* (*County of London*), London, 1897, vi. p. 472.

56 Cf. GLMS. 9234/2 [3rd fol. section], f. 97r. Forty years later, Bishop Laud ordered all Sunday afternoon sermons to be turned into catechisms by questions and answers (D. Neal, *The History of the Puritans*, London, 1882, ii. p. 170).

57 Cardwell, *Doc. Annals*, i. pp. 440-1.

58 GLMS. 9234/2 [2nd fol. section] ff. 24v, 34v, 42v, 111r.

59 *Endowed Charities*, vi. p. 548.

60 Ibid., vi. p. 523

61 Ibid., vi. pp. 449, 458; GLMS. 1046/1, f. 79r.; Somerset House, PCC 59 Windsor (will of William Garrett, merchant taylor).

62 Somerset House, PCC 1, 2 Kidd. The preachers were Stephen Egerton, William Chark, Edward Phillips, and Anthony Wootton.

63 Jordan, op. cit., pp. 375; *Endowed Charities*, vi. pp. 459-61, 468, 486, 628, 722.

64 See *Records of the Borough of Leicester*, ed. Mary Bateson, Cambridge, 1905, iii. pp. l-li; Knappen, op. cit., p. 221.

65 Dorothy Williams, "Puritanism in the City Government 1610-40", *Guildhall Miscellany*, No. 4, p. 5. £40 was then granted towards the maintenance of the St Antholin lectures.

66 London Corporation Rec. Office, Remembrancia, i. ff. 113v., 118v., 137r., 139v.; Letter Book Z, f. 194v.

67 B.M., Landsdowne MS. 33, 23.

68 E.g. GLMS. 4072/1, f. 50r.

69 E. M. Tomlinson, *A History of the Minories*, London, 1907, p. 214.

70 GLMS. 1568, pp. 230, 238.

71 The vestry of St Stephen Walbrook in 1582 made a grant towards the maintenance of the lecturer at the neighbouring church of St Mary Woolchurch (GLMS. 593/2, f. 2r.).

72 *The Vestry Minute Books of . . . St. Bartholomew Exchange*, ed. E. Freshfield, London, 1890, pp. 17-18.

73 *Memorials of Stepney Parish*, pp. 10-11.

74 E.g. GLMS. 6836, ff. 26r.-33r.; GLMS. 1013/1, f. f. 53r., 62r.

75 J. E. Cox, *The Annals of St. Helen's Bishopsgate*, London, 1876, p. 106.

76 GLMS. 1013/1, f. 62r.

77 GLMS. 1454, Nos. 72-4; GLMS. 4072/1, f. 76v.

78 GLMS. 2590/1, pp. 92-106 passim.

79 Ibid., p. 92. A similar salary was given to the lecturer at St Saviour's Southwark, where the impropriation was also in the hands of the parishioners (Florence Higham, *Southwark Story*, London, 1955, p. 132).

80 E.g. St Stephen Coleman St (GLMS. 4457/2, f. 38v. et seq.), and St Lawrence Pountney (GLMS. 3907/1, [no fol.]).

81 GLMS. 1013/1, f. 62r.

82 GLMS. 1176/1, [no fol.].

83 GLMS. 1002/1, ff. 201r., 232r.

84 GLMS. 9234/1, f. 235v; 9234/6, f. 97r.

85 *Harrison's Description of England*, ed. F. J. Furnivall, London, 1877, p. 22.

86 E.g. Christopher Threlkeld at St Botolph Aldgate (GLMS. 9234/1, f. 235v.).

[87] Christopher Rosedale, for instance, was rector of the small living of St Benet Sherehog, and at the same time lecturer at Christ Church and curate at St Antholin (PRO, E. 179, 43/298; St Bart's Hosp. Rec. Office, Hb 1/2 [1578-9]).

[88] For an account of these tax obligations, see the writer's thesis, pp. 327-36.

[89] His total known salary was £50 p.a.

[90] At St Botolph Aldgate, the lecturer preached eight consecutive sermons on Matt. 27. 2-11. Altogether, he devoted twenty-four hour lectures to this chapter in little over a year (GLMS. 9234/5, passim).

[91] Parochial contributions were even necessary at St Antholin, the most heavily endowed of all the London parishes (GLMS. 1046/1, f. 79r.).

RELIGION AND SCIENCE: A PHILOSOPHER'S APPROACH[1]

I. T. RAMSEY

In recent days there has been a variety of attempts by very diverse people, and not always for the same reasons, to stress not so much, or even at all, the conflict between religion and science, as their radical difference and independence. Professor John Wisdom, for example, began a notable essay on *Gods*[2] by saying: "The existence of God is not an experimental issue in the way it was"—looking back, rightly or wrongly, to the time when Elijah proved his case before the prophets of Baal. Professor A. G. N. Flew broadened the point by arguing, again rightly or wrongly, that while the believer in God can allow nothing to count against his belief, everyone knows that scientific generalizations on the other hand can always be falsified and will be set aside if events so demand.[3] But it is not only unbelieving philosophers who insist on differences of this kind between science and religion. In his book *Mystery and Philosophy* the late Michael Foster emphasized the way in which he thought that scientific method came dangerously near to being irreligious. "The aim of modern science is man's mastery over nature"[4] (he says) and nothing is more typical of these masterful intentions than "the experimental method" which "is a method of commanding nature to answer man's questions".[5] It is a "putting of nature to the question".[6] But if theology put God to the question and tested its theories by results, it would be, Mr Foster would say, "to tempt the Lord God in the way prohibited",[7] i.e. in the Temptation narratives. These various quotations make two points:

1. that modern science encourages man to develop his own mastery and subjects nature to an Inquisition, and

2. that scientific method has to be set entirely aside when we turn to religion and theology. Indeed, to investigate God by the methods which natural science uses, would be to yield to a temptation of the devil, which the religious man must renounce. There is a methodological incompatibility between religion and science.

Now let me make it clear from the outset that it is not the purpose of this paper to assert the logical identity of scientific

and religious discourse. That view belongs to a past age. Differences, and important differences, of methodology there certainly are. Yet I wish to show how the two approaches, *despite* their differences, are not incompatible. On the contrary, they have their meeting places. Nay, more, they may be and must be united.

Further, at the outset, let me emphasize that for the most part this paper will be concerned with scientific *method*. Science is not the name for some logically homogeneous group of assertions. It is rather a *method* in the development of which several kinds of logically distinguishable assertions are made, some, though not all of which, have theological associations of the kind we must explore. Let us turn then to scientific method and look at some of its logical features with a view to answering the question: how far is the approach, the attitude, the methods, of the scientist compatible with a religious attitude? For this is the question which spotlights for the philosopher the crucial point of present day discussion about science and religion. The debate is not about conclusions, but about methodology.

For our purpose we shall distinguish five features in scientific method; five stages as the scientist proceeds from his simplest generalization to the most complex hypothesis:

1. *The Start*

Science starts with ordinary commonsense assertions about what can be seen, heard, touched, tasted, or smelt. For example, the following assertions would be among those of interest to the scientist: "There is a stone falling"; "See the planet moving"; "The water is boiling"; "These vegetables are decomposing"; "Those rabbits are reproducing".

2. *Simple Generalizations*

The scientist's next move is to formulate invariants within such ostensible diversity. To illustrate this second stage of scientific method let us take the simplest kind of scientific situation: Tom, Dick, and Harry, who are all boiling water. The scientist links these situations not merely because the phrase "boiling water" would be used by each of them—for this is a very vague phrase with a very open texture—but because a thread of mercury in a glass tube—a thermometer—measures in each calorimeter or beaker more or less what is called 100° Centigrade. Here, very

roughly described, is the background to the simplest kind of scientific generalization: "Water boils at 100° Centigrade." Here is a phrase—"100° Centigrade"—which, as an invariant, not only brings precision and clarity into the assertions of Tom, Dick, and Harry, but unites all the Toms, Dicks, and Harrys boiling water in the kingdom. Yet already we must make two points which are often forgotten by those who make too superficial generalizations about scientific method. The first point is that even this simple generalization is not bound rigidly to the facts. It is suggested by them, yes. But in the end it is an option, which goes beyond them. How many thermometers measure accurately 100° Centigrade? Or would continue to register this temperature if peered at through lenses, and so on? The simple generalization is (as I have said) very closely associated with the facts, but it is reached in a disclosure which occurs when we survey the different thermometers, whereupon a certain figure "100° C" suggests itself, forces itself on our attention. The generalization depends on the "facts", but does not, in any science worthy of the name, merely report them in close detail.

The second point of importance is to recognize the important part which the appeal to "experimental error" can play. Here is a trump card which will safeguard most simple generalizations which are grounded in disclosures occurring around a group of closely similar spatio-temporal events. It can for so long, and in so many ways, feather-bed useful and simple generalizations which the scientist wishes to keep.

3. *Development of Simple Generalizations*

But let us not be unfair. Refuge will not always be taken in experimental error. Provided we are only boiling water in the cellar or in the attic, as well as in the kitchen, all will be well. But suppose we go to the top of Ben Nevis. We shall say that water "is boiling", but our thermometer will not read 100° C at the top of Ben Nevis. It will read somewhat less (say) 99.8° C. For some time we may talk about experimental error, but when a vast company of climbers, armed with thermometers, has boiled water at the top of Ben Nevis, and when all of their thermometers have significantly measured less than 100° C the earlier generalization will be modified. It would not so much be shown to be wrong, for the situations to which it gave precision and unity before, would still be given

precision and unity by it. It would still, over a certain area, be a reputable invariant. But its inadequacy has now been indicated. The simple invariant needs to be further extended, and we now say, "Water boils at 100° C at normal pressure". Or (still more accurately and typically) "Water boils at a temperature t when the pressure is p" and where for some function of t and p, $f(t, p)=0$. Further, when p is "normal", $t=100°$ C. With this more complicated phrase everyone's kettle is now covered, whether in laboratory, kitchen, attic, or cellar, or even on Ben Nevis. We have now produced a much more resistant generalization, a much better invariant arising in a disclosure which encloses many more spatio-temporal data than did its predecessors.

Further, we could now deduce that down a Lancashire coal mine, or a French limestone cavern, water will boil at a temperature greater than 100° C. Notice, that we can *deduce* such an assertion from our generalization, and further, that this assertion can be subsequently *verified*. Here is a crucial element in scientific method—verifiable deductions, and it is an element which (as we shall see) theology cannot and must not provide.

4. *Large-scale Hypotheses*

But the scientist's interest will not stop here. The better the scientist the more comprehensive, extensive, and powerful, must be his invariant. To illustrate the high generalizations at which the scientist aims, let us take a very mixed group of commonsense assertions such as the following, and for our purpose it does not matter whether they are true or false:

"An apple is falling to the ground."

"A planet is moving to an ellipse."

"That bullet will score a bulls-eye."

"A Britannia locomotive with twelve carriages will slip on certain inclines."

"The road must have a better camber at that corner if buses are not to turn over."

"High water at Greenwich yesterday was 10 p.m."

"A partial eclipse of the sun, visible in England, occurred in November 1959."

Now what the physicist does when searching for newer and more far-reaching theories is to bring together such diverse situations as these assertions describe, hoping that some common

feature or other will strike him, will (in other words) evoke a disclosure. It is in this way that scientific "insight" is associated with what we have called invariants, features (hitherto unnoticed) which the diverse situations have in common; and the more diverse the situations that an invariant unites when it becomes the occasion of a disclosure, the more original and distinguished the scientist. For example, in the case of the apple falling and the planet moving, these two situations, hitherto regarded as wholly disparate (as disparate indeed as earth and heaven) may suddenly "connect"—as they once did presumably for Newton. A moment of vision" occurred around a common feature: in this case, "force producing movement".

At this point we need to make an important complication to the story. When the events are sufficiently similar (as in the cases of boiling water) and the common feature is sufficiently simple (as in the case of thermometers registering 100° C), the scientist may well imagine that no currency beyond the mathematical symbols (here: "100° C") is required to do justice to what is disclosed.

But when invariants are associated with vastly diverse situations, two possibilities arise:

(i) As in the simpler case, so in this, mathematical symbols may still be invaluable as currency for the invariant.

(ii) At the same time the disclosure which embraces so much spatio-temporal diversity, may well also suggest some word of a metaphysical brand, especially if a similar disclosure embracing a similar diversity has been in the past the basis for such a metaphysical word. For instance, a certain invariant arising in a disclosure which embraces great diversity (such diversity as is indicated, for instance, by the assertions at the start in this section) may be expressed in terms of the symbols for a mathematical point (x, y, z). But since this invariant arises in the same sort of context in which metaphysicians have spoken of "particle" or "atom"—when a disclosure likewise embraces various "things" of maximum diversity—the invariant may be given a metaphysical interpretation as well. We may thus call the invariant (mathematically) (x, y, z), or (metaphysically) "a particle".

Now in the old days the mathematical symbols and the metaphysical concept were virtually equated. Here were the days when mathematics was thought to describe "reality", which was neither more nor less than mathematics talked about. But to-day the

question arises: Is "mass", for example, merely short-hand for something measurable, a mere label for the symbol "m", or does it tell us of some metaphysical secret of the Universe vouchsafed in a disclosure? Or again, in the case of "force": here is a word which may be taken as merely labelling what can be symbolized mathematically as "rate of charge of momentum" $(\frac{d}{dt}(mv))$; or it may be a concept from metaphysics, when it is assimilated to "power" and "activity".

Those same two possibilities can arise not only about mass and force, but, for Newton, they also arise about absolute space and absolute time. They also arise around an atom for Dalton, natural selection for Darwin, periodicity for a theory of the elements, the electron when used as a basis for an electronic theory of valency or of co-ordination compounds, and so on; and with continuous creation for Hoyle. All these words might work metaphysically or not. Let us look a little more closely at this ambiguity which such key words display.

Let it be granted that, so far as physics and chemistry go, we might take words like "Force" or "Absolute Space" in Newton's hypothesis, or "Periodicity" in the case of the elements, as no more than convenient co-ordinating words or classificatory devices which have neither meaning nor function other than the heuristic use they are thus given. On this view dominating ideas rounding off a scientific theory of high generality would be just jingles whose use is assimilated to the appropriate mathematical symbolism, or spatio-temporal pattern of scientific interest. With such a status they would resemble very closely Kant's Ideas of Reason as used "regulatively", and it is interesting to remember that Kant himself compared this regulative use of an Idea of Reason with the physicists' use of the concept of "image", under whose unifying power various haphazard generalizations became a theory of reflection, from which could be deduced countless easy deductions which are subsequently verified.[8] But are the key-ideas of large scale scientific theories no more than jingles?

Certainly most scientists in theory, and all scientists in practice, have behaved as though the key words of a scientific theory were more than jingles. Newton's hypothesis, as we have seen, was linked with a "metaphysical" background (however uneasy or otherwise the relationship between them both in his own mind). Dalton's Atomic theory had its ancestry in the more or less vague

atomic "meta"-"physics" of Democritus, Boyle, and Newton. Even though the Periodic Table may seem to be exceptional and a plain case of nothing but a classificatory idea, I think it is quite clear that someone like Mendeleeff, who elaborated it for the first time, thought he had somehow been taken nearer to what he would have called the "Truth": a full insight into the universe.

At any rate it is certainly the case that as scientific hypotheses increase in scope and importance, embracing a whole variety of generalizations, scientific method sponsors increasingly scientific invariants or absolutes which happen to have an ambiguous status. Now one possibility of science being different from, yet united with, theology, depends precisely on the possibility of these key-words, which arise in relation to disclosure situations, being capable of more than a mathematical interpretation. Does science itself rule out that possibility? Or, on the contrary, does it even hint at it? This question leads us at once to two important if rather difficult topics.

(a) The first topic is known as *operationalism*, which for our present purpose can be seen as a method of giving these scientific absolutes a wholly scientific placing. Certainly we must allow that at least since Einstein, many scientific concepts, some of which in earlier days seemed highly metaphysical, e.g. Absolute Space, have been given an "operational" definition, referring more or less directly to what can be measured and calculated. So Absolute Space is given a relativistic setting. Here are concepts which Bridgman calls "instrumental",[9] and which Dingle [10] would suggest can be derived from an analysis of what measurement involves. So far it looks as if scientific procedure could get rid of all hang-overs from earlier metaphysics.

But it is significant that when one sort of metaphysics has thus been expelled by this empirical rigour, the need for other concepts with a curious logical status, has immediately shown itself. We have needed other correlating concepts—key ideas, dominating analogies—not altogether unlike what Bridgman calls "paper and pencil" concepts; not unlike the correlating concepts to which Dingle would give a pictorial use, where such pictures are associated with flights of the imagination, and (let us remember) talk of imagination is never very far from talk about disclosures.

So, as scientific hypotheses increase in scope and become wider generalizations, it is true that operationalism often purifies these

hypotheses from crude metaphysical speculations which have hung around from the beginning as man's vision is extended, as he seeks a theory of the Universe. But, as the second type of concept suggests, it is a mistake to suppose that in consequence hypotheses at some time might dispense with "queer ideas" altogether. Certainly the ideas may get fewer, but if anything, they get queerer. The further operationalism goes, the more the need for correlating unifying concepts. So we do not seem able to avoid the conclusion that scientific method, when it reaches this fourth stage, demands metaphysics. One sort of metaphysics is expelled, only to make room for another. Nor is this surprising. For if our account is correct it suggests that the key-words derive from, and witness to, the scientist being more than a detached observer; that they may arise from that kind of transaction with—even rapport with—the Universe we have called a disclosure.

Operational concepts are thus founded in what the scientist does, and the theory of operationalism brings the observer centrally and actively into the scientific situation. This means that our earlier question—about the double interpretation of key-words—is now transformed and becomes: Can an account ever given *by* the scientist himself, *of* the scientist himself, in wholly scientific, i.e. "object", terms? Here is a question which is surely to be given a negative answer: otherwise, we would objectify the subject.[11] So room is left for metaphysical key-words.

(b) The same conclusion is reached by considering the development in physics known as *information theory*, which would analyse scientific knowledge in terms of the acquisitioning of information. We have seen already, from our independent approach, that scientific conclusions always witness to the language tool being used to extract them. Information theory likewise emphasizes that scientific answers are always relative to the particular scientific questions that are being asked at a given time, and to the features of situations being thus examined.[12]

But the further claim is now made that typical scientific concepts like entropy, and generalizations such as the Uncertainty Principle, are nothing more than indicators which register and exhibit the kind of questions being asked. In other words they reveal nothing more than the character—the logical structure— of the scientific language being used. Once again scientific method, with empirical rigour, may be brushing away subsistent entities by

the dozen. At the same time, however, the scientist is becoming essentially involved in his science. Scientific procedure becomes more and more akin to a question-answer game, with its language resembling the logic of a dialogue. Key words now relate to large-scale options made by the scientist in his interchange with the universe, and scientific theory expresses a scientist's attempt at conversation with the universe. There is no suggestion that the scientist is a Grand Inquisitor.

It looks, then, as if science cannot exclude metaphysical words. Though it may try to lay less and less weight on them within scientific method, scientific method itself involves the scientist as an active subject who cannot himself be objectified and restricted to observables. Scientific Method then ponits to a metaphysical supplement. But does it ever positively *need* these words? Does scientific method ever call explicitly for metaphysics? So we come to 5.

5. *The Conversion of Hypotheses: the Demand for a Total Map*

It is now time to see what happens when a hypothesis, no matter how previously convincing or comprehensive, is modified or converted, and (as we shall see) this will in the end afford us an answer to the question we have just raised. In the conversion of hypotheses certain key words, around which cluster on the one hand mathematical equations and techniques, and which on the other hand are associated with disclosures, these key-words are replaced by others allowing of more powerful generalizations. One of the best known examples is the progressive modification of the phlogiston theory of combustion and its ultimate replacement by the oxygen theory. Another example is the Newtonian hypothesis which with all its glorious generalizations and dominating concepts, had in the end to give place to others. Experimental data in heat, light, and electro-magnetics led respectively to the concept of entropy, the theory of relativity and to the quantum theory, for none of which a straightforward Newtonian treatment could be given. Thus arose Einstein with the idea of relative space; and nearer our own time, Eddington with his cosmical number and so on.

Notice that a scientific hypothesis may be modified or there may be a conversion, but a scientific hypothesis is never given a knock-down falsification. There is no comparison with a betting game;

no scientific hypothesis is ever "dead right" or "dead wrong". It is merely that one scientific absolute from a certain point of view produces a more powerful synthesis than another. But the usefulness of the old absolute remains. A scientific hypothesis, if it is ever any use at all, will always continue to have that use.

When people speak, as they once did, of a scientific hypothesis being completely falsified, the idea was that facts and language were both homogeneous. So H_1 was said to be a good approximation for an area of facts A_1. But when, for some reason or another, A_1, became A_2, an area which included A_1 and something else, whereupon another hypothesis, H_2 was demanded, it was said either that H_1 was somehow or other "in" H_2, or that H_2 was a hypothesis which showed that H_1, which had once been supposed valid, was now false. But what we have come to see is that there is only the most remote logical kinship between H_1 and H_2. Here are two distinct logical areas. But the point was only seen when scientific method demanded and profitably used both the hypotheses H_1 and H_2 at the same time.

Not long ago the scientist was puzzled by this demand and possibility, and to recall a hackneyed example we may mention the two theories of light—the corpuscular theory and the wave theory—both of which were demanded for scientific inquiry. Here were phenomena demanding on the one hand treatment in such mathematics as suggested wave pictures, continuous wave motions; on the other hand treatment was also demanded in terms of mathematics whose pictures were discontinuous corpuscles or particles. At first, with the old picture of scientific method and hypothesis in mind, scientists tried somehow to make the two hypotheses one. But by this time the attempt has been seen for what it is—a wild goose chase, and scientists must be content to use at one and the same time, languages of different logical structure about similar situations. Here, briefly and crudely expressed, is the theory of complementarity.[13] The picture of scientific language, far from being homogeneous as was at one time supposed, has rather to be pictured as a hierarchy of logically diversified languages.

Nor let us suppose that this outlook is all that modern. Let us notice a footnote which is to be found in a quite elementary book published some twenty-five years ago: F. B. Finter's *Introduction to Physical Chemistry*. He says, in connection with the atomic

theory (p. 15), "Even if we attempt to 'explain' chemical reactions in terms of electrons instead of atoms, the validity and the use of the atomic hypothesis remains unchanged. We are only superimposing an additional 'electronic hypothesis, in an attempt to get still nearer the truth." Finter spoke of Dalton's atomic theory, but the same could be said for the Newtonian hypothesis and, I would dare to say, the phlogiston theory.

Where now is this leading us? For the moment it seems as though we are left with what is often now called the fragmentation of science. Ask "why" questions in one way and we get a question-answer game played in the language H_1; ask "why" questions in another way and we get a question-answer game played in the language H_2.

Yet we must recall that scientific method never gives up its fifth feature, its hope of sponsoring some one overall scheme, one total language map, for the whole universe. But how is this going to be reached from a multiplicity of logically variegated languages? Has the old idea of science to be abandoned? Can scientific method never again give us one theory of the Universe? Are we committed to a scientific Tower of Babel? That is the problem which contemporary science by its increasing fragmentation sets us. We shall see presently that it is precisely at this point that science can profitably and properly call again on those metaphysical words which for the first four stages of its method it had rather cold-shouldered. But before continuing our argument, let us summarize our position so far in four points to see how far and where this scientific methodology is compatible with a religious attitude.

1. The scientist, as we have seen, does not keep all that close to "the facts". What he needs besides and more than the facts, is insight, intuition, some sort of disclosure. To that degree the scientist is not particularly "humble" before "the facts". At the same time, he has generalizations from which deductions can be made which can be verifiably tested. Now here is a divergence between the hypotheses of science and religion, if religion be allowed hypotheses at all. The scientist has options which are always just a little far-fetched, but they can find currency in, e.g. mathematics, which permits of deductions, verifiable or falsifiable as the case may be.

2. Yet the scientist does not put the universe to the test; he tests rather his generalizations, the invariants which have been disclosed

to him, which have been grasped by his insight, an insight correlative with a disclosure. The scientist does not put the universe to the question. He rather puts his questions—about his provisional invariants—to the universe and lets the universe decide for him. All he puts to the question are his theories. He sponsors some invariant and follows it through till the universe gives him an answer, tells him whether his faith has been well-founded, or not; whether his insight has or has not been reliable, whether or not he is a false prophet. Here is something potentially religious.

3. Further, the scientist is always willing to revise his beliefs and to sponsor alternative absolutes. In this sense he is humble, and again potentially religious.

4. At the same time the scientist searches for an overall scheme and to this extent his whole aim might be said to be to control everything by scientific techniques.[14] Here, it might be said, and here especially, is Michael Foster's strong point. But can the languages, of science give us a completely exhaustive map? The brief answer is, logically, no. For what exceeds the language of science are the very disclosures which scientific method itself demands, and which become the more prominent, and their logical status the clearer, as scientific method proceeds.

On what conditions then, shall we ever possess one adequate language-map of the Universe—a map embracing not only the diverse languages of science, but also the supplement which those languages seem to need? The question has brought us back to the point where we paused in the discussion, and it is time to take up the matter again. Fragmentation, we noticed, is logically inescapable if we are to be mere scientists. As a scientist, a man is doomed to disappointment if his aim is an overall scheme. Each generalization, each theory, has its significance which is never wholly taken over by another. The scientist has a diversity of options. But now the vital question recurs: Can we, and on what conditions can we, recapture the old ideal of science as providing us with one language map of the universe? Where can words be found to unite the diverse languages of science? Where can science find its hopes justified? What does conversation and dialogue with the universe imply?

Here at the end I venture to outline a possible answer. I would like to argue that it is at this point that science and religion become supplementary in a way which helps both, yet humbles both.

There is no space to do more than give a mere outline. But let us approach that outline with such reflections as these.

If a word (or words) is to unite the diverse languages of science, it must occur in phrases which are entailed by all kinds of scientific assertions. Yet it must not of itself be native to any one of the logically diverse languages of science, or fragmentation will remain. But because the key-word is *not* native to the language of science, it now follows that key-assertions will never entail verifiable deductions. How can this be? Have we any paradigm for such words or phrases?

Let us begin by taking the assertion "I exist". This certainly is entailed by all kinds of scientific assertions. "He has a heart beating", "He has a blood count of X", "He has a digestive system characterized by all that the bio-chemistry of fats, proteins, carbohydrates, and enzymes can teach us", "He has such and such reflex actions", "He has such and such brain potentials": "I exist", is entailed by all these, when said of me. But "I exist" entails none of these. We cannot necessarily *deduce* from "I exist" any of these *particular* assertions. Yet the affirmation of my existence is that which gives all these varied assertions their concrete reference; is that which unites them all.

Now what I suggest is that the word "God" must be seen as a logical kinsman of "I" in having, at least in these two respects, a similar logical behaviour. "God exists" entails no particular verifiable assertions. Theology can provide no verifiable deductions. But this does not mean that it has no empirical relevance. On the contrary, like "I exist", "God exists" is a phrase which is in fact entailed by and so linked with verifiable language, while entailing none of it. The latter point used to be expressed in old-fashioned language by people who said "The world is not necessary to God". As to the earlier point, namely: that scientific assertions entail "God exists" as some entail "I exist": this used to be expressed as "God is necessary to the world". Further, the basis for "God exists" is an affirmation which arises around the universe in a moment of disclosure, in a moment of worship, indeed in prayer. It is thus like the basis for "I exist".[15] Here, in worship, scientific assertions are integrated with, yet distinguished from, the theological assertion of God's existence.

Let us go back for a moment to Professor Wisdom and Elijah. Not even here had we an experimental issue. The fire did not test a

hypothesis. No assertion about fire coming down can be deduced from "God exists" or from anything Elijah said. When the fire came down it did something very different from providing the verifiable criteria for a hypothesis, something very different which Wisdom (and, it may be said, others) does not sufficiently distinguish. It answered a prayer. Indeed we may, with due deference, suggest that in many ways the story would have been religiously more enlightening if the fire had not come down. For it would have shown us better how the religious man can keep his affirmation but modify and develop his theology. As it was, the verifiable success might have tempted Elijah or his opponents to think that God could always be tested, would always provide verifiable criteria and then God would have become a scientific concept. Here I entirely agree with the protests that Mr Foster makes.

Yet if religion and science are not identical, I want to emphasize that they are complementary. Religion can give to science that affirmation of the universe which it needs. It can give to science the basis of fact presupposed by operationalism and information theory; it can supply a suitable key word to organize the logical diversification of large-scale scientific theory. Religion can give all this to the scientist. But the scientist must then, *in the end*, give up his verifiable hopes. For this key word "God" has not a scientific logic so that "God exists" entails no verifiable conclusions; besides "I", its kinsmen are rather those "metaphysical" words which science has from time to time sponsored, and which (as we saw) were currency for disclosures, even though the scientist for most of his working day might find a mathematical understanding of the disclosure quite adequate.

Science can satisfy religion in its venture after fuller and fuller relevance, after more and more adequate discursive expression. But theology must then share in the tentative character of science, and be prepared to lose any verbal and verifiable guarantees for which it might once have yearned. We can regain the old ideal, alike of science and metaphysical theology, for one map, only when that map loses in the end its purely scientific character; only when it sponsors some metaphysical words of which "mass", "force", "evolution" were once favourites, though I have outlined a means of substituting "God" for them all. I have suggested that the scientist can only secure his wildest dreams when he becomes

religious. At the same time the theologian can only secure his wildest dreams when he becomes scientific.

Science and religion may find a synthesis in their methods. But the cost to each is great. The theologian must admit a tentative theology; the scientist must admit key words which cannot (and it is a logical *cannot*) be given straight scientific verification. Yet theologian and scientist meet where all meet—in the affirmation of the universe which is wonder and worship at what the universe discloses.

1 Based on a lecture given at Sion College, London, 30 November 1959.

2 *Proc. Aris. Soc.*, 1944-5, pp. 185-206.

3 See e.g. *New Essays in Philosophical Theology*, Ch. VI.

4 Loc. cit., p. 61.

5 Loc. cit., p. 61.

6 Loc. cit., pp. 56, 58.

7 Loc. cit., p. 62.

8 *Critique of Pure Reason*. Appendix to the Transcendental Didactic. "The Regulative Employment of the Ideas of Pure Reason." N. Kemp Smith (abridged translation), p. 301.

9 *Nature* 166. 1950. p. 91. See also the discussion by M. B. Hesse, *Science and the Human Imagination*, Ch. VII.

10 *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, I. 1950.

11 For a further discussion see: *Proc. Aris. Soc.* Suppl. Vol. XXXIII. 1959. I. T. Ramsey, "Paradox in Religion". esp. pp. 214-15 and I. T. Ramsey, *Freedom and Immorality*, esp. Ch. I and II.

12 Once again we can see why scientific hypotheses, if any use at all, are never wholly outmoded.

13 The example may stand even though claims have been made that in this case fragmentation has been overcome. This claim I would counter on logical grounds, but in any case fragmentation in general remains simply because no scientific theory of any real use is ever "falsified". Nor do more comprehensive scientific theories say *everything* which was said by the more restricted theories they often replaced. Cf. the preceding paragraphs and the next two paragraphs.

14 Some might think that the technologist was of all scientists the most "dangerous" to religion, the one whose methods and practices reflect nothing but a striving for mastery, and that Michael Foster might well have had the technologist in mind rather than the pure scientific thinker. Now it is true that the technologist will have little time for disclosures. Rule of thumb methods; the slide-rule and so on represent best his habits and practices. At the same time, his scientific progress raises moral problems of the highest magnitude: and it may be that here he finds his disclosures—moral disclosures—which can supply him with the "compensation" he needs. In short, the salvation of technology may well have to be found in the moral issues to which it stirs the technologist.

15 Cf. I. T. Ramsey, loc. cit. and *Religious Language*, esp. pp. 61-5; also *Phil. Quarterly*, July 1955, pp. 193-204.

RELIGION AND THE ROYAL SOCIETY*

W. R. MATTHEWS

> O send out thy light and thy truth; let them lead me: let them bring me unto thy holy hill and to thy tabernacles. Ps. 43. 3.

We welcome to-day members of the Royal Society of London and many distinguished friends and visitors who are attending the celebration of three hundred years of work in the cause of Science. Nowhere could they be more welcome, and no church could be more appropriate as the place where thanksgivings should be offered for the past and prayers for the future success of this world renowned learned society. For we remember with pride that Christopher Wren, the architect of this cathedral in whose masterpiece we are assembled to-day, was a founder member of the Royal Society. In a lecture at Gresham College, not far from here, he suggested the formation of a select group of learned men to pursue the quest of the knowledge of nature by experiment. From that fruitful suggestion the Royal Society took its rise. And thus in 1660 this famous society began. It was not quite the first of such societies, but almost the first, and beyond doubt it soon became the most important, its example begetting in course of time other similar voluntary associations for the advance of science.

1660 was the year of the Restoration of the Monarchy in England and the return of Charles II from exile. It is only just that Charles's part in the project which Wren and his friends promoted should be remembered, for his patronage and his interest were of importance in the early years of its existence. Charles was by no means a model king or a model Christian, but he was an intelligent man and both of Wren's interests, St Paul's Cathedral and the Royal Society, owe something to him.

The Royal Society was a product of a change in intellectual outlook. Europe, and England with it, had passed through a period when differences of religious beliefs, controversies on metaphysical dogmas, had rent nations and embittered war. The world was wearied by theological dispute. The empirical method, that of observation and experiment, of which Francis Bacon was the pioneer, seemed to promise a way of peace. Let us look at the facts with the aim of finding out what they really are and cease to deduce from general principle what they ought to be. Such was the

* Sermon preached by the Dean of St Paul's in the Cathedral on the Occasion of the Tercentenary of the Royal Society of London: 24 July 1960.

simple plan which, as we know, has led to the amazing development of modern science.

The original members of the Royal Society were not, however, opposed to religion. Far from that, they were Christian believers of liberal views and they were convinced that, in the end, their investigations would lend support to the belief in God and the chief Christian doctrines. Robert Boyle, for example, who has been called the Father of Chemistry, endowed a lectureship, which still exists under his name, on the evidence for Christianity. The great generalization of the Law of Gravitation was regarded by Newton and most of his contemporaries as a wonderful confirmation of the existence of a wise and benevolent Creator.

It would be interesting to compare the expectations of the founding members of the Royal Society with what has actually happened. I suppose, to take one aspect of the matter, that they had no conception of the enormous complexity of nature as science would disclose it, nor of the possibilities of the scientific method in the framing and verification of hypotheses. They were pioneers at the entrance of a new and unknown country. They were, it might be said, on an adventure of faith, and, like Abraham, went forth not knowing whither they went. Nor did they have any premonition of the effect of the development of science on religion and theology. I think that it may be appropriate here if I venture to make some remarks on this subject which, owing to the rise of Scientific Humanism, is very much alive to-day.

The relations between Science and Religion during the three hundred years since 1660 have on the whole been both comic and tragic; a comedy of errors and a tragedy in the proper meaning of that word—a conflict of good and noble principles and persons. It would be tedious to recount the whole story of the conflict. Since this year is the centenary of the historical controversy between Bishop Wilberforce and T. H. Huxley on the Darwinian theory of evolution, we may well take that as a kind of paradigm or salient example of the conflict at its most acute. Very few educated Christians to-day could sympathize with the stand taken then by the representatives of orthodox Christianity. They exhibited a stubborn resistance to new knowledge and a reluctance to examine evidence which we can scarcely understand. Yet these men were intelligent and honest, some of them, like Gladstone and Wilberforce himself, forward-looking and reforming in other

spheres. What then was the cause of their violent reaction against the new hypotheses? They believed that they were defending a truth so precious and so fundamental that any apparent attack upon it, or weakening of its authority over men's minds, must be repelled. In my opinion, fundamentally they were right. The belief in God the Creator and his revelation held a truth that mankind cannot abandon—it is not only a truth, but a saving truth. But they were wrong, disastrously wrong, in thinking that this truth depended upon the literal accuracy of the Creation Myths in Genesis. They were wrong too in thinking that the Bible was a source of scientific knowledge. And this error led them to a further error which really contradicted their own faith. They believed that God was the eternal wisdom and truth and, therefore, that all truth is in some degree a revelation of God. They ought, surely, to have concluded that no truth could be unholy and all claims that new truth has been discovered ought to be candidly examined.

Can we say that all the blame for any estrangement between science and religious faith must be assigned to the men of religion? I think not. Just as the theologians failed to recognize the limitations of their method, so scientists have often been oblivious of the limits of theirs. The error is natural enough. The triumphs of the scientific method have been so amazing and so continuous that it has been easy to imagine that this is not only a way to truth but the only way, so that any alleged truth which is not the result of scientific inquiry can be dismissed. In this connection one might refer with respect to Scientific Humanism. No doubt there are scientific humanists who do not hold that there is no truth but scientific truth, but when we are exhorted to accept a view of existence and of the place of man in it based solely on scientific results we may ask whether the foundation will sustain the structure. For surely it cannot be accepted that there is no significant knowledge except scientific knowledge. There are things of great moment of which we are certain, but not in the sense that they can be scientifically proved. That it is better to be merciful than cruel; that it is better to be a victim of injustice than to be unjust; that truth is always to be preferred to error and illusion; all these propositions, and others of like kind seem to me to be more certain than, let us say, the second law of Thermodynamics, and to be of more enduring value to the human race, and yet, if I were challenged to give any scientific reason for believing them,

I should not know where to begin. To put this consideration shortly: science, by its method, abstracts from values and can, therefore, not judge them. We may use the results of science for any purpose we choose, but science cannot tell us whether our purpose is good or evil.

Scientific Humanism has much to say to thoughtful Christians. Though I think that its full programme of eliminating every trace of the supernatural and putting human wisdom and progress in the place of God and Providence is profoundly mistaken and could, if adopted by the public as the final truth, be disastrous; we have to learn that we who believe in God cannot afford to neglect or forget the revelation of science. Though it is not the whole truth, in so far as it is true, we must accept it gladly as from God and meant for our learning. Shall we not find, when we consider the creation in the light of science, that our conception of the Creator has been vastly too narrow? We have thought of him too much as like ourselves, we have been too anthropomorphic in our theology and our devotions. As the inconceivable and illimitable universe is revealed and mystery after mystery unfolds, we should be, like Job when he encountered God, abashed and overwhelmed.

But we need not stay so. We ought not to. For the history of science is not only discovery of nature; it is also the discovery of the human mind. All this structure of reasoned knowledge has been worked out, thought out and comprehended by human minds. How great a wonder and a mystery is the human mind and personality in which such powers reside! When we reflect upon it, we are inclined to agree with Aristotle, that "early father" of science, that in some sense the human reason is divine. Surely, if there is a revelation of God, we should expect to find it most evidently in human persons.

And that is our Christian belief: God manifest in man; not in scientific man, or economic man, or literary man, or any specialized man, but in Man, and supremely manifested in one who described himself as the Son of Man, which in his language meant simply "the Man", representing all men. He lived and died for all men and, as we believe, is alive for evermore.

Neither Science or Religion has spoken its last word. It is certain that before the next centenary of the Royal Society comes round all the current text books will long have been obsolete. Religious thought moves more slowly, but it moves, partly under

the stimulus of science. I pray that the course of development in both may bring them closer together, each learning from the other, so that these two majestic forms of the spirit of man may unite in the worship and service of the God of truth.

CORRESPONDENCE

SIR,—I have only lately read *The Shape of the Liturgy*. The beauty and learning of the book was marred for me by the chapter on Cranmer. I send these few quotations in case you should think them worth publishing on Cranmer's behalf. Dix portrays Cranmer as a man devoted to what he believes to be the truth. Cranmer would sincerely thank him. But Cranmer would not subscribe the beliefs Dix attributes to him. These short quotations illustrate two of the points where Dix on Cranmer and Cranmer on the truth are at variance.

1

Dix:

"The true background of Cranmer's work is, as I have said, the contemporary post-mediaeval liturgical crisis, and the Kirchenordnungen of the German and Swiss Reformation which sought to solve it. The rite of 1552 takes its natural place among these. It is *not* a disordered attempt at a catholic rite." (*The Shape of the Liturgy*, p. 672.)

The Council's Letter to Princess Mary 1550:

"That which we profess hath the foundation in scriptures, upon plain texts and no glosses, the confirmation thereof by the use in the primitive church, not in this latter corrupted. And indeed our greatest change is not in the substance of our faith, no, not in any one article of our creed. Only the difference is that we use the ceremonies observations and sacraments of our religion as the apostles and first fathers in the primitive church did: you use the same that corruption of time brought in." (*Cranmer's Works* II, Parker Soc., p. 528.)

Cranmer's Appeal at his Degradation 1555:

"And touching my doctrine of the sacrament and other my doctrine, of what kind soever it be, I protest that it was never my mind to write, speak or understand anything contrary to the most holy word of God or else against the holy catholic church of Christ; but purely and simply to imitate and teach those things only which I had learned of the sacred scripture and of the holy catholic church of Christ from the beginning, and also according to the exposition of the most holy and learned fathers and martyrs of the church." (Ibid., p. 227.)

2

Dix:

Zwingli's "doctrine of the sacraments . . . leaves them no force or efficacy of their own whatsoever. They are bare signs or ceremonies by which a man assures other people rather than himself of his saving faith in Christ's redemption." (*The Shape of the Liturgy*, p. 632.)

Dix:

"Cranmer . . . was a Zwinglian." (Ibid., p. 728.)

Article 26 of the XLII Articles of 1553:

"Sacraments ordained by the word of God be not only badges and tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace and God's goodwill towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him." (Gibson's *Thirty-Nine Articles*, p. 81.)

Cranmer's Answer:

"And they [the bread and wine] be no bare or vain tokens as you would persuade, for a bare token is that which betokeneth only and giveth nothing, as a painted fire which giveth neither light nor heat; but in the due ministration of the sacraments God is present, working with his word and sacraments." (*Cranmer's Works* I. II.)

Dix:

"Cranmer . . . believed that the spiritual feeding on the most precious Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ is nothing else but the purely mental remembrance of the passion with faith." (*The Shape of the Liturgy*, p. 667.)

Cranmer's Answer:

"It is my constant faith and belief that we receive Christ in the sacrament verily and truly; and this is plainly taught and set forth in my book. But that 'verily', as I with Chrysostom and all the old authors take it, is not of such a sort as you would have it. For your understanding of 'verily' is so Capernaical so gross and so dull in the perceiving of this mystery that you think a man cannot receive the body of Christ verily, unless he take him corporally in his corporal mouth . . . And yet, because I deny only this gross understanding you misreport my doctrine that I should say 'we receive not Christ at all but in a figure, and no body at all'; wherein you untruly and slanderously report me, as my whole book and doctrine can witness against you . . . This feeding is a spiritual feeding and an heavenly feeding, far passing all corporal and carnal feeding; and thereby there is a true presence and a true feeding in deed." (*Cranmer's Works* I, p. 185.)

3

(This is added to show Dix and the Marian documents at variance.)

Dix:

"There appears to have been no legal compulsion to church in the reign of Mary and little need for it." (*The Shape of the Liturgy*, p. 687.)

No. 16 of the Articles sent by Queen Mary to the bishops 1554:

"That by the bishop of the diocese an uniform doctrine be set forth by homilies or otherwise for the good instruction and teaching of all people; and that the bishop and other persons aforesaid do compel the parishioners to come to their several churches, and there devoutly to

hear divine service as of reason they ought." (Wilkins' *Concilia IV*, p. 90.)

Bishop Bonner's monition to all curates of his diocese 1555:

". . . We do will and command you . . . that ye do note the names of all such as be not confessed unto you, and do not receive of you the said sacrament" at Easter, "certifying us or our chancellor or commissary thereof . . . so that . . . we may proceed against them . . ." (Ibid., p. 115.)

Wayland Cottage,
Ideford,
Newton Abbot.

CAROLINE BICKERSTETH.

THE DEAN OF SALISBURY ON INTERCOMMUNION

SIR,—It is possible to agree with the Dean of Salisbury's conclusion that intercommunion ought to be refused altogether until it can become reciprocal, without necessarily agreeing with the whole of the argument by which he reaches it. And I would venture to suggest that the key to the question with which he is rightly concerned, of the nature of the Eucharist as celebrated in the non-episcopal bodies, is to be found in the fact that the Eucharist is not primarily a vehicle of sanctifying grace to the individual participant but is the means by which Christ continually draws his Body the Catholic Church into organic union with his offering of himself to the glory of the Father.

There is surely no reason for even the most recalcitrant "Catholic" to deny that the devout participant in a non-episcopalian celebration of the Lord's Supper receives the grace of God as fully as the devout participant in the Catholic Mass, for sanctifying grace is on any showing as fully available outside the Eucharist as within it, for example in prayer, the devotional study of the Bible and the offering of the ordinary duties of life in the service of God. It is only the deep-rooted individualism of modern religion that has led people to invent a specific kind of grace called sacramental grace, mysteriously different not merely in its vehicle but in its essence, from non-sacramental grace, in order to find something for the sacraments to do and to provide them with a *raison d'être*. It is of course the function of baptism to incorporate the individual into the Body of Christ, but once that has been done all the grace that he receives is essentially the same, whether it is received in the sacraments or not, for it is simply the efflorescence of his baptismal union with Christ and the assimilation of his own human nature to that of the Head. What the Eucharist is primarily concerned with is not the sanctification of the individual at all, though like all the other means of grace it can promote it, but the organic offering to God of the Whole Christ by the Whole Christ. If, therefore, we hold, as I think the Dean does hold, that the historic ministry, centred in the

episcopate and perpetuated through it, is a divinely ordained and essential organ of the Body, it will follow that no eucharistic celebration can be organically integrated into that offering unless the ministerial organ is there fulfilling its proper organic function. What is being done may be a means of superabundant grace to those taking part, it may be thoroughly pleasing to God and may redound to his glory, but by the nature of the case it will not be the organic offering of the Whole Christ by the Whole Christ. It will, of course, be related to that offering, for those who are taking part have, it is to be presumed, been made Christ's members by their baptism, and God will gladly bestow on them any grace that they are morally capable of receiving; what is lacking is the essential organ through which their action could be fully and organically integrated into the offering of the Whole Christ.

If the Eucharist is understood in this way—and it is, as I see it, the only way in which justice can be done to both the moral character of God and the concrete corporality of the Church and its historic ministry—we can, I suggest, see, if not a coercive argument at least the *ratio convenientiae*, for the otherwise puzzling fact that the Church has been led to accept the validity of baptism administered by a lay person or even (as the Western, though not, I think, the Eastern Church has held) an unbeliever, while insisting on the necessity of a bishop or presbyter for the celebration of the Eucharist. For, to use a somewhat crude illustration, a man who is outside a door can push another man through, provided those who are inside have unlocked the door and are prepared to receive the newcomer; but once he is inside he can live the life of the community only by conforming to its nature.

If we approach the problem of Christian unity and of the Sacrament of unity in some such way as this, we shall, I think, be delivered from those vacillations and incoherencies of statement to which the Dean of Salisbury rightly draws attention, though it should perhaps be noticed that the Lambeth Conference appears to have rather pointedly avoided explicitly endorsing all the assertions of its Committee on Unity. And we may be able to address ourselves to our non-episcopalian brethren more intelligibly and also more charitably than has sometimes been the case in the past.

Christ Church,
Oxford.

E. L. Mascall

REVIEWS

PRESBYTERIAN DOCTRINE OF CHURCH AND MINISTRY

A Manual of Church Doctrine according to the Church of Scotland. By H. J. Wotherspoon and J. M. Kirkpatrick. Second edition, revised and enlarged by T. F. Torrance and Ronald Selby Wright. Oxford University Press. 15s.

This book, which was originally published in 1920 and is now reissued in a revised and enlarged edition, is of more than usual interest at the present time. It is clear, comprehensive, unambiguous and at the same time charitable; it is a pity that it was not readily available at the time of the Anglican-Presbyterian conversations.

A member of another communion may well be surprised that a book on Calvinist doctrine contains no reference whatever to Predestination. A Presbyterian scholar to whom this was pointed out replied that the title of the book meant that it was concerned with doctrine about the Church and not with the Church's doctrine about Christianity as a whole. This reply does not seem to me to be altogether satisfactory, for if Christian doctrine is an organic whole and not an assortment of uncorrelated items it is hard to see how a doctrine as basic as that of Predestination is in Calvinism can fail to have implications for the Church, the Ministry, and the Sacraments. We should hardly find a Lutheran expounding the doctrine of the Church without any reference to Justification! One is in fact left wondering how typical of the Church of Scotland is the extremely high-church doctrine expounded in this book. But there can be no doubt about its interest and importance.

The book opens with a discussion of the creation of the Church and of the Sacraments as an essential part of the Gospel. The permanence of the Incarnation is stressed in a way which is markedly different from that of the late D. M. Baillie in *The Theology of the Sacraments* ("The historic incarnation of God on earth . . . did not go on for ever, but came to an end", op. cit., p. 65), and the essential difference between the Sacraments of the Old Dispensation and of the New is expounded in a somewhat uncalvinistic manner (cf. *Institutes*, IV, xiv). Infant Baptism is looked upon as the ideal and normal form, though there is no suggestion that Christ's invitation to the little children to come unto him might include the reception of Holy Communion. The Eucharistic doctrine expounded is that of a high receptionism; both Zwinglianism and transubstantiation are repudiated. Frequent celebration of the Communion is desiderated, and the prevailing infrequency is ascribed, as are some other practical defects, to the influence of English Puritanism, a movement with which the authors show little sympathy. The Apostolic witness is frankly recognized as being prior to the New Testament scripture, but "the Scriptures of the New Testament give us, in regard to the whole Revelation of God, the

complete mind of the teaching Church during the age and under the censorship of the Apostles in its obedient transmission and faithful understanding of the Revelation of Christ in Word and Act" (p. 57). The Catholic Creeds are warmly defended.

Anglicans will naturally read with special interest the sections on the Ministry, and they may well be surprised by the intransigent insistence on its Apostolic and transcendent character. "In the Apostles as forming the foundation of the Church all ministry was contained, and from them only existing ministry is derived as a ministry dependent on the Apostles and ordered by them. The Apostles chose and ordained men to be ministers, not to succeed them in their unique Apostolic office, but to succeed to as much of their function as is transmissible." "The laying on of hands appointed by the Apostles to be used in ordaining men to the holy ministry attests that this ministry derives both *mediately* from the historical and risen Jesus through the Apostles and *immediately* from the ascended King and Head of the Church through the Holy Spirit." The ministry is a *divine, perpetual,* and *essential* ordinance. "They who stand in it are *Christ's* Ministers, and their ministerial acts are done in His Name, being acts which are proper to Christ only, as Apostle of God, and Mediator of the New Covenant and High Priest over the House of God." "The Ministry does not represent the people before the Face of God. The Minister is not appointed by the people, nor is he their delegate, and is not therefore responsible to the people. He is sent by Christ and acts in Christ's name, representing Him; and only because Christ—and He alone—represents the people vicariously before God does the Minister represent the people *in Christ*" (pp. 74-6).

In view of such statements as these we are not surprised to learn that in 1911 the Church of Scotland insisted on reordaining a Wesleyan minister who had applied for recognition as ordained. What is surprising is that in Canada, South India, and North India Presbyterian Churches have gone into union with Congregational and Methodist bodies, accepting the ministries of the latter as identical in character and validity with their own, for the doctrine of the ministry expounded in this book and supported by quotations from the weightiest authorities is flatly incompatible with that of Congregationalism and Methodism. "The Church of Scotland allows no power in the people, but only in the Pastors of the Church, to appoint or ordain Church officers", declared the Assembly in 1698. "Our Church doth condemn any doctrine that tends to support the people's power of ordaining their ministers", wrote Steuart of Pardovan. More daringly still, Principal George Hill asserted: "We presbyterians join with the Church of Rome and the Church of England in holding that the persons vested with Church government derive their powers not from the people, but from Jesus Christ by His Ministers" (p. 94).

Are we wrong in supposing that Calvinistic practice has not always come up to the level of Calvinistic theology? That we are not is suggested by the declaration of the Church of Scotland in 1954 that it "affirms its intention of seeking closer relations with every other

Church with which it stands in fundamental doctrinal agreement, but from which it is separated in matters of government and the ordering of the ministry" (p. 104). Nobody could read this book without seeing that its authors would vehemently deny that matters of government and the ordering of the ministry were outside the sphere of fundamental doctrine; in this they would agree with the Anglo-Catholics who produced the report *Catholicity* in 1947 (op. cit., p. 44).

Where, then, is the difference in this matter of the ministry between high Calvinism and high Anglicanism? Perhaps it goes down to the level of the basic interpretation of the Christian religion.

> It is important [wrote the authors of *Catholicity*] to recognise how great is the difference between the high churchmanship of a Calvinist and that of a Catholic. To the former, Church order is a means of disciplining the elect (and others) in the obedience to the Divine Gospel and Law; to the Catholic, Church order is the expression of the continuity, from the Incarnation, of the Body of Christ wherein the faithful are incorporated. To the former, again, the determining doctrine is Election by God in His transcendent sovereignty; to the latter, sacramental union with Christ Incarnate in His Mystical Body. The difference is profound. (Ibid., p. 27.)

If this diagnosis is correct we can see again how unfortunate it is that Wotherspoon and Kirkpatrick decided to expound the theology of the Church without first expounding their understanding of basic Christian existence. However, on the more empirical level of the ministry itself, the main point at issue is that of the parity or imparity of ministers and of the organ of ordination. For Calvinism, the authority to ordain lies not in the bishop but in the corporate presbyterate. "Ordination is the act of a presbytery: the power of ordering the work is in the whole presbytery." "Individual presbyters cannot ordain. Presbyters may not voluntarily associate themselves to ordain. They must act in their place in the Church's system" (p. 98).

We may note in passing that "presbyters orderly associated may ordain only 'for the congregations within their bounds', which mark the limits of their jurisdiction as a court. To ordain for a more general purpose (as for Foreign or Mission service) requires the authorisation of the General Assembly" (p. 99). This assumption that a minister is ordained for a limited sphere of work is of course in sharp contrast with the Catholic doctrine that ordination is to "the office and work of a priest in the Church of God"; it would seem to bear out the assertion of *Catholicity* that in Calvinism the minister is concerned much more with the order and discipline of the people of God than with their sacramental life in Christ. How this works out in practice I do not know; it would seem to necessitate that a minister would need to be reordained on moving from one presbytery to another, but I doubt whether this happens in practice. It is in any case notorious what difficulties have arisen in the attempt to combine these two different views of the Ministry, as local and universal respectively, in the Plan of Church Union in North India and Pakistan.

To return to the former point, our authors make a determined attempt to support the Presbyterian view by recent work on the history of the early Church. Whether the evidence necessarily demands the interpretation which they place upon it may perhaps be doubted; I should like to see a detailed examination of this part of the book by an expert patristic scholar. We may in any case note that they admit the universal development, and in some cases at a very early date indeed, of a monarchical episcopate, and indeed they seem quite ready to accept episcopacy as long as the episcopate is not considered as a distinct *order* in the technical sense. With a constitutional episcopacy as a form of government they appear to have no quarrel, though this will not solve their differences with Anglicans. For neither have Anglicans any irreconcilable objection to presbyterianism *as a form of government*; that is not where the real issue lies. That issue is concerned not with government but with sacramental character. It was this that the Anglican-Presbyterian commission so adroitly failed to discuss, and with it, as Bishop Eric Graham implied, in an article which merits close attention ("Priesthood and Reunion", in *C.Q.R.*, CLIX, p. 473, Oct.-Dec. 1958), the cognate question of Priesthood.

In a recent book on Christian Unity Dr C. B. Moss wrote as follows:

> Some Scottish Presbyterians claim to have a "presbyteral succession". I have no interest in disproving this theory: it would be a step towards unity, if Presbyterians universally accepted the principle of succession, even if only presbyteral. But the theory appears to be quite untenable, for the following reasons.
>
> The Calvinists repudiated the unreformed Church entirely. They re-ordained all bishops and priests of the Roman Communion whom they wished to make Reformed ministers, as Dr Ainslie has shown. The First Book of Discipline in Scotland abolished the laying on of hands: which was not restored till after 30 years, when the new ministry could no longer be confused with the old. There is no evidence before about 1650 that there was any claim to a "presbyteral succession". This claim is not made by any of the Reformed Churches on the Continent. Even in Britain, the Presbyterians now recognise the Congregational Union as a sister Church (which the old Presbyterians certainly did not do): and the Congregationalists not only reject succession in every form, but maintain that no congregation can be required to accept any creed, and that baptism is quite unnecessary. (*What do we mean by Reunion?*, pp. 81f. The reference is to J. L. Ainslie, *Doctrines of the Reformed Ministry in the 16th-17th Centuries.*)

And again:

> John Calvin, holding that the existing Church and ministry were totally corrupt, set up a new Church with a new ministry of a different kind, which, he claimed, was a revival of the ministry referred to in the New Testament.
>
> It was a ministry of preachers, and not of priests: it neither had nor claimed any connexion with the old ministry. Its authority was not derived from the Apostles, but, as was believed, from the direct internal call of God to the minister and the outward call of the congregation.

> Ordination by the laying on of hands gave the recognition of the local church to the choice of the congregation, but was not considered absolutely necessary. Neither Calvin nor his successor Beza were ever ordained at all; Knox was a priest before the Reformation (though it appears to be unknown who ordained him), but he repudiated his priesthood, and derived his authority as a Reformed preacher from the call of the congregation of St Andrew's. (Ibid., pp. 78f.)

This is a very different impression of the Presbyterian doctrine of the ministry from that which is given in the book now under review, and the matter is hardly settled by its authors' assertion that "the Church of Scotland has been very conscious that ministerial succession cannot be abstracted from the living continuity of the whole Church as the redeemed people of God" (p. 95). When they add to their assertion that "ministerial succession in no way secures the possession of the Holy Spirit nor does it guarantee a lawful ministry" the further qualification that "because it is the apostolically appointed ordinance, it cannot be condemned or neglected without disobedience or loss" (p. 98), they appear to be condemning their founders and fathers. I think a good many Anglicans when they have read the new edition of Wotherspoon and Kirkpatrick, will find themselves wondering, with Dr Moss, whether either the history or the present practice of the Church of Scotland bears out the theological claims made by the high-church Presbyterian divines. But this will not lessen their gratitude to the editors for making once more available, and in an up-to-date presentation, a book which is a model of clear and succinct theological exposition.

E. L. Mascall

ORIGINS OF GNOSTICISM

Gnosticism and Early Christianity. By R. M. Grant. Columbia University Press; London: Oxford University Press. 31s. 6d.

It is perhaps not unfair to describe this fascinating work as the inevitable book. It represents a reassessment of Gnosticism in the light of the researches of H. J. Schoeps, R. McL. Wilson, and J. Daniélou on the influence of Judaism, and particularly of heterodox Judaism, on the early history of Christianity. Previously scholarship has emphasized in turn the importance of Greek philosophy and Iranian thought; now it is the turn of Judaism to receive special attention. Each hypothesis in turn has proved more successful in calling attention to an important source than in excluding its rivals, and this is likely to prove the case with Grant's hypothesis.

The author claims that Gnosticism arose from the debris of apocalyptic hopes which resulted from the Fall of Jerusalem. It arose from

failure of nerve and has much of the character of an escape mechanism of the human spirit. While Burkitt regarded Gnosticism as the attempt to find a substitute for Christian eschatology, Grant relates it directly to the downfall of Jewish hopes. He regards its historical *Sitz im Leben* as deeply significant, though, as he realizes in his Introduction, there is some danger of an argument from *post hoc* to *propter hoc*. He claims that the original religious clientele of Gnosticism were ex-Jews or disappointed Jews, though clearly later in the second century a serious bid for the allegiance of members of the Great Church was being made. Nor should its appeal to straight pagans be overlooked. The Gnostic Justin claimed that those who understood his system possessed the key to all mythology. It is difficult to feel satisfied that we have enough evidence either to prove or to disprove Grant's suggestion. Something will of course depend on the question whether there are echoes or merely anticipations of Gnosticism in certain New Testament writings which antedate the Fall of Jerusalem.

Grant has little difficulty in establishing the importance of Jewish apocalyptic as a major source for Gnostic material and the close relationship between the Gnostic myths and Jewish *haggada*. Interest in the Jewish calendar has revived considerably since the discoveries at Qumran, and the author believes that elements drawn from this field were incorporated into Gnosticism. Whether this is more than an adaptation of numbers already made familiar in calendrical contexts might perhaps need to be argued at some greater length.

The general characteristics of Gnosticism are excellently drawn. Its passionate subjectivism, its fundamental pessimism over history and the present world order (for the Gnostic the world was just hell) are of the first importance. The interpretation of Gnostic mythology as virtually frustration symbols may well commend itself, but nothing forbids the use of the same symbols for cosmological purposes. Their haggadic background might be consistent with such an interpretation.

The idea of development within the Gnostic systems themselves is aptly illustrated. Indeed if the Gospel of Truth is to be credited to Valentinus himself (as seems probable) this has been as good as confirmed. Here the author aptly criticizes Quispel's theory of Valentinian developments, though the Dutch scholar was of course writing before the recent discoveries at Nag Hammadi. Grant's own reconstruction of the development of Simonianism is an excellent application of the genetic-historical method to Gnostic material, though at some points it contains (perhaps inevitably) a high percentage of conjecture. His criticisms of a linear development within Gnosticism from myth to philosophy are trenchant and well founded. In some cases a later attempt at demythologization seems a more probable explanation. Yet a revaluation of the influence of Greek philosophy in the light of recent studies from other points seems urgently required. While there is little probability that Harnack's extreme hypothesis would come back into favour, it is possible that the influence of Greek thought was more than mere window dressing.

The most controversial part of the book is the chapter on Gnosticism and Early Christianity. While rightly noting that the Synoptic interpretation of Jesus contains few elements which can be assigned to a Gnostic background. Grant holds that the original picture was heightened in two different directions: towards apocalyptic eschatology on the one hand and towards Gnosticism on the other. This view might suggest a rather undue reliance upon the concept of "realized eschatology". Whether there are Gnostic traces in St Paul must be regarded as still a matter which is *sub judice*. It is still possible to interpret them as dovetails into the Pauline tradition upon which the Gnostics would seize with avidity and transpose in the process, to conjecture in some cases that St Paul (like a good missionary) was seizing upon ideas current in other religious contexts in order to secure *a point d'appui* for the Gospel. Such a phrase as "the mythological background of St Paul's thought" may well prove to be an overstatement. Semi-Gnostic traits in the Fourth Gospel and the writings of St Ignatius are indicated (not for the first time). That there is a borderland between the New Testament and Gnosticism need not be doubted, and the use of the Fourth Gospel in Gnostic circles is clear enough. In both cases, however, it remains a difficulty that both writers expressly and repeatedly rejected the docetism which formed a natural part of many Gnostic systems. How far the Gnostic use of the Fourth Gospel was not also an abuse is still open for discussion.

No one, however, would wish to question the author's chief conclusion. The lineaments of the Gnostic Redeemer are no other than those of our Lord himself. Gnostic subjectivism (salvation considered as escape), the flight from the sovereignty of God expressed in Time and Space, and the substitution of a spiritual *élite* for the universal Church are the acid tests of the failure of the movement. The keynote of historic Christianity is not escape but engagement, not flight, but involvement.

H. E. W. Turner

THE RELIGIOUS DISPUTATION IN THE BARLAAM LEGEND

Der Religionsdisput der Barlaam-Legende, ein Motiv abendlaendischer Dichtung. By Hiram Peri (Pflaum). University of Salamanca. n.p.

This is a superb treatment of a little-known theme, the motif of the religious disputation in Western versions of the Barlaam legend. The author is Professor of Romance Philology in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and his work is published under the auspices of the University of Salamanca. It includes a *bibliographie raisonée* of 378 items and a Table showing the interrelation of the various forms of the Barlaam legend from its Buddhist origins through the Greek

romance attributed to St John of Damascus and through the Old French, Old High German, and Middle English to its more recent Italian and Spanish forms. Ten versions of the Religious Disputation are included with brief annotations.

It is one of the curiosities of literature that a Buddhist legend, transmitted through Manichaean sources, should have become so popular in Christian circles. The idea of a religious Romance had no doubt had its precursors in some incidents in the Apocryphal Acts as an attempt to provide more innocent reading of a secular type for Christians than could be found within contemporary paganism. The religious disputation is certainly a Christian insertion in the legend, probably derived from the Public Religious Disputation of Byzantine times which had a predominantly missionary purpose. In the Greek form of the legend later discoveries were to establish the presence of the early Apology of Aristides. The author traces the development of this theme through the various forms of the tradition. The formal character of the Apology is usually retained, but the content shows a tendency to change from age to age. Scholastic methods of argument are introduced, and in some forms there is even a hint of the Tridentine Definitions.

While the detailed problem investigated may seem to possess a somewhat limited appeal, the questions discussed have a far wider bearing on the history of culture, not only from the theological but also from the literary point of view.

H. E. W. Turner

A GREAT LITURGIOLOGIST

The Life and Work of Edmund Bishop. By Nigel Abercrombie. Longmans. 70s.

The year 1959 was *annus mirabilis* for large and important biographies. And Dr Abercrombie's life of Edmund Bishop is worthy to stand beside the lives of others who have cut a greater figure in the world. Yet the first reaction of many will be to wonder not that it is well done but that it is done at all. For most people have never heard of Bishop. Those who share his interests venerate him as a master. But only at Downside hitherto can the whole man have been known and appreciated.

In fact there are three Edmund Bishops: the liberal Victorian convert to Rome; the scholar; and the inspirer of monastic studies. Dr Abercrombie brings all three to life and provides an interesting contribution to the history of Bishop's lifetime as well as to the periods which he studied. In all three characters he worked, and was content to work, largely in the background; yet in each he exercised an influence which is still evident forty years after his death.

The convert had to live the religion of his choice through a period

that included many difficulties for a man of his character and attainments. In early days there was the atmosphere that led Acton to bring to an end the *Home and Foreign Review;* later there was the trouble over modernism and the tragedy of Fr Tyrrell. The *Home and Foreign* affair led Bishop to think that there was no vocation in the Church for a learned layman. Yet he persevered with his studies. So that, when it came to controversy between himself and Duchesne, it was the layman who was the victor. It seems to have been his suggestion that led to the present distribution of the Psalter in the Roman Breviary. And those who worship in Westminster Cathedral have cause to be grateful for his influence with Cardinal and architect. Bishop suffered much frustration, but never the impotence that he had feared.

Bishop the scholar is known most widely from the collection of papers called *Liturgica Historica.* Here his pre-eminence was due to no privileges of education. He had a gift for languages and a genius for palaeography, together with a vivid yet disciplined historical imagination. In the cultivation and development of these gifts he was self-taught. The result was a series of discoveries and observations which are accepted and built upon to-day, although they were often unwelcome to the professional scholars of his own time; and the most remarkable thing about his work is the small amount of revision that it needs after a period of study which has not been lacking in documentary discoveries or re-appraisals. The explanation is to be found in the fact that Bishop's conclusions were founded upon an intimate acquaintance not only with the documents themselves but also with their circumstances, ecclesiastical, literary, and diplomatic. He would ignore none of the evidence; but further than that evidence could take him he would not go.

Bishop's work for monastic studies may be summed up by describing him as the godfather of the Downside tradition of scholarship. When you use a book by Dom Cuthbert Butler or by Dom Connolly, for instance, you are using the fruit of an erudition which Edmund Bishop made possible. When he went to Downside for the first time its scholarship was unimpressive; and those have not been lacking who were content that it should be so. Such opposition was, however, overcome by Bishop and the monks whom he inspired with the Maurist ideal. The debt of Downside scholars is indeed plain enough from his overt collaboration in the published work of Butler, Chapman, Gasquet, and Connolly. What has been less plain hitherto is the extent to which it is due to the perseverance of Bishop that such a tradition of scholarship was established at all alongside the great demands of the school and the "mission".

There can be little doubt that the discipline which Bishop felt obliged to impose upon himself in the intellectual atmosphere of nineteenth-century Roman Catholicism became a source of strength. This self-discipline amounted to a withdrawal from theology and an attachment to "pure" history. It meant that he had no theological axe to grind in interpreting the past and that when he considered the meaning and

intention of the documents he could approach them with scarcely more emotion than a Christian scholar who has read himself into a sympathetic understanding of the rites of ancient Egypt. Such an approach has its limitations. But it is an approach which was badly needed during the period of Bishop's working life, when scholars were too often men quarrying in the past for support for their ideas of theology or sociology. It is therefore not surprising that he neither appreciated nor was appreciated by many of his contemporaries. This opposition had the good result of stimulating Bishop to some of his best work. But it also made him as unjust to others as they were to him. In particular, his harsh criticisms of new editions of liturgical texts make unhappy reading. In this field we are still greatly in the debt of such men as Brightman, Wilson, and Bannister. On the other hand, it is due to Bishop that we still have no edition of the Barberini Euchologion. So the judgement of history cannot be entirely on the side of Bishop and against those of whom he had so poor an opinion.

For all this, Bishop was a genius who will remain an inspiration to others. But he is not an easy person to understand, and some of his essays are not easy to read. Dr Abercrombie has provided not only a most agreeable biography but also the essential companion to Bishop's writings. The only complaint that can be made of the book is its price. But, even at seventy shillings, those who study the things Bishop studied cannot afford to be without it.

BERNARD WIGAN

FOOTNOTE TO ANGLICAN HISTORY

FASHIONS IN CHURCH FURNISHINGS, 1840-1940. By PETER F. ANSON. Faith Press. 50s.

MR PETER ANSON'S exhaustive book is of more importance than its title would suggest. It is a running commentary on the progress of the Church in England in the century between 1840 and 1940. Mr Anson writes sympathetically of the past, and his pages exhibit a nostalgic affection for the furnishings beloved by Victorian Church builders and restorers, the Minton tiles and Gothic gas-standards, which adorned churches of that period; and he regrets the change of taste which has decreed their removal.

His book is, among other things, a revelation of the persecutions and frustrations which fell to the lot of the pioneers. Most Churchmen have some knowledge of the persecutions under the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874, but there are many instances in Mr Anson's book to show that these were by no means the only examples Thus Bishop Tait refused to consecrate a church at Sydenham (then in his diocese) until a simple mural cross at the back of the altar had been removed. He delayed the consecration of All Saints' Margaret Street for weeks and only consented to perform the ceremony when he learned that the Prince Consort was favourably impressed by the church. Even

then, the frontal had to be removed before the service could begin. Not only the bishops, but the Court, the legal profession, and more particularly the Press were arrayed against the Church Revival. *Punch*, in particular, was persistently offensive without being funny, and lent its support to the persecutors of Bryan King, the rector of St George-in-the-East.

Even in Scotland, the movement met with episcopal opposition. Dr Wordsworth (the originator of the Boat Race), Bishop of St Andrews, would not worship in his own cathedral because of the very mild amount of ceremonial prevailing there.

It is only in the light of these disclosures that we can understand the mentality of so many of the later clergy, who came to distrust bishops and to regard them as their natural enemies. The embittered withdrawal from active participation in Church life of men like Dr F. G. Lee is accounted for in Mr Anson's record (p. 183). If we wish to understand the curious phenomenon that the bishops were distrusted by the very men who were labouring to exalt the episcopal office, we have only to turn to Mr Anson's pages.

But the book must be read with caution; the author writes as a Roman Catholic, and despite his nostalgic recollections of Anglican churches there is no mistaking the anti-Anglican bias which peeps out on nearly every page. Thus he qualifies his tribute to Anglo-Catholic pioneers by the remark that "their ideals seem slightly ludicrous in a new historical concept" (p. 162). Ideals which have transformed the Church of England and successfully vindicated its claim to employ the adjuncts of Catholic worship are naturally obnoxious to Romanists who deny that claim. But there was nothing ludicrous about the determined men who promoted the movement, though they paid little deference to that modern deity "a sense of humour". They knew what they wanted —and they achieved it in great measure, for which Romans can never forgive them. Mr Anson betrays his inability to understand the aims of these earnest men when he writes with irritating superiority: "Looking back over a century, it is difficult to understand the mentality of these utterly sincere and devoted clergymen. After all, what were the Six Points but an Anglican adaptation of the then current rules of the Sacred Congregation of Rites intended for the Roman Church only?" (p. 207). He quite fails to realize that the clergy in question were not "ritualists" but valued and fought for the beliefs of which the outward adjuncts were at that time the symbol.

The author is a persistent fault-finder and manages to say something disparaging about most of the churches he describes. Thus the pioneer church of St Matthias, Stoke Newington, which enjoyed extraordinary success in the 'fifties and 'sixties of last century, is dismissed as a church which "familiarised the middle-class inhabitants of North London with a ponderous type of Gregorian chant". This church had enormous congregations, and was the home of musicians like Dr Monk, editor of *Hymns A. and M.*, Helmore, Spenser Nottingham, and others, and of Francis Bumpus, the ecclesiologist whom Mr Anson

quotes frequently. Completely untrue is his account of St Augustine's Kilburn (p. 223) of which he says: "This once famous centre of militant Anglo-Catholicism conveys, alas, the impression to-day of being moribund." Doubtless, in both the churches mentioned, congregations are not what they were, as both parishes (well known to the present writer) have been inundated by the Jewish influx, but the Church life is exceptionally vigorous. This tendency to denigration leads us to wonder if the author is not the victim of disguised envy. Thus his condescending dismissal of the work of the American architect, R. A. Cram, makes one wonder if his judgement is altogether unbiased. He describes the works of Dr Cram and his associates as "regarded indulgently as curios and relegated to the status of museum pieces" (p. 278). Naturally, the Romanist writer can see no need for the side-chapels in our cathedrals, and resents their restoration to use. To him they are only suitable as "receptacles for busts and monuments". Mr Basil Clarke's rather unfortunate description of mid-century Anglican churches is quoted with approval: "Symbolising spiritual pride, self-sufficiency, clericalism, complacency, Philistinism and patronage of the poor". Mr Anson follows that rather unreliable guide Professor Pevsner in his attack on Butterfield, who is accused of valuing ugliness for its own sake. True, modern taste does not approve that architect's polychromatic decoration (though Mr Anson is the first to complain when it has been covered up), but most of Butterfield's churches have a beauty of proportion, and their height and dignity make an impression on the worshipper which is not found in the neat and undistinguished churches of many of his contemporaries. Pevsner sees nothing in the magnificent Bodley church at Clumber except what he calls "an eerie memorial of the passing of an age" (p. 233). Bodley was perhaps the most outstanding of the Victorian architects, but his work is described by our author as "Mr Bodley's imitation medievalism". But then, he was a convinced and unashamed Anglican. Nor does a later architect of note, Fellowes Prynne, fare any better; his "cosy little Morning chapels" are compared with the suburban cosy drawing-rooms, and he is described as filling his panels with sentimentalized copies of Fra Angelico angels and saints. No doubt he had many mannerisms, and they serve to provide our persistent fault-finder with an opportunity of denigration. Fellowes Prynne was the son of a famous Anglo-Catholic priest—and did not go over to Rome.

The quite preposterous statement is made on p. 273 that Anglican clergy and artists purposely set out to create "a dim, twilight world, which had no relation to ordinary humdrum life". We should have liked to hear Fr Dolling's verdict on this piece of impertinence. When we are told that "Anglican clergy were dressing up their churches to create an illusion of security" we rub our eyes in astonishment. Most of them were very ordinary, practical men, not always gifted with great artistic insight but fired with a desire to give their people the best that resources allowed. But when he deals with a genuinely artistic clergyman, Percy Dearmer, Mr Anson is equally hard to please, for he dismisses him as a

Protestant with a Lutheran temperament because "his detestation of everything Romish increased as he grew older" (p. 313). That was unpardonable.

The estimate of Sir Ninian Comper's work is so fanciful as to be almost fantastic (pp. 283ff): it is described as possessing "the quality of expensive caviare, costly chocolates, or glacé pears and imported greengages". It is quite mistaken to say that Sir Ninian Comper introduced reservation among Anglicans (p.286). There were large numbers of churches in London, and many in the Provinces, where the Holy Sacrament was reserved, as may be gathered from the Report of the Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline of 1906. Yet Mr Anson states that only two churches, St Columba Haggerston and St Cuthbert's Earls Court had public Reservation.

Mr Anson's book is entertaining, illuminating, and informative, though at times infuriating. Readers cannot fail to discern that outlook which is unhappily distinctive of R. C. writers. It is the Soviet mentality applied to things ecclesiastical. The Communist makes the Party the measure of all things, and truth is that which agrees with the "party line". The Roman Catholic, however well disposed—and undeniably Mr Anson has a real regard for the work of those Anglican builders and priests whom he describes—must judge all things by their conformity to his own communion. On this hypothesis, Anglicanism is a strange sect, and its efforts must partake of eccentricity if not of insincerity.

MARCUS DONOVAN

CHURCH ARCHITECTURE

LITURGY AND ARCHITECTURE. By PETER HAMMOND. Barrie and Rockliff. 37s. 6d.

MR HAMMOND has written a trumpet blast against the influence of medievalism on modern Anglican ecclesiology. And very good the book is, one to be read by all who have the care of a church. The major part is devoted to a survey of modern church architecture, on the continent from 1923 and in England from 1928, and to a consideration of how medieval churches can be rearranged to meet modern liturgical needs. There are numerous descriptions of modern English and continental churches, and also exciting plans and photographs. Mr Hammond writes in the light of a principle: that the plan of the ordinary English church, inherited from the late middle ages, revived by the Victorians and still much favoured to-day, is unsuited to the modern presentation of the liturgy. By this principle many English churches, old and new, stand condemned. Although Mr Hammond overstates his case, there is foundation for what he says. The ordinary English plan of church, with its main altar a long way from the people and obtrusive choir stalls in between, the columns that block the view of

the liturgical centres at every turn, is often, unless radically re-planned, more of a liability than an asset liturgically to a parish.

Mr Hammond would like us to rid ourselves of inherited conceptions about the plan of a church, and think of it primarily as a room in which the altar and seats for the congregation are arranged in a convenient relationship to each other for the celebration of the liturgy. Valuable suggestions on possible relationships are made on pages 84-91, the most important in the book. His ideal church has one liturgical centre, and was not uncommon in England in the eighteenth century. The parishes Mr Hammond has most in mind are those where the chief Sunday service is of the parish communion type. But it is equally well adapted to the parish where much is made on Sundays of Sung Mattins and Evensong. For choir seats need not be elevated above the congregation in the chancel; they can be the front seats of the nave, or on a raised platform or gallery at the side or back. The reading desk, lectern, pulpit, even font, can form one liturgical centre with the altar.

Unfortunately many of the modern churches, which the book holds up as an example, do not wear well. Rudolf Schwarz' church, Corpus Christi, at Aachen, receives high praise. Buried deep in a dreary housing estate, this church, as the present reviewer saw it on a damp Spring afternoon, presented a depressing and shabby appearance inside and out, though hardly thirty years old. On the other hand, Charlemagne's masterpiece, the octagonal nave of what is now Aachen cathedral, is still after nearly twelve hundred years one of the most powerful and gripping buildings in Europe. Mr Hammond says that one way in which to find that liturgical-architectural renewal, for which so many of us long, is through study of modern continental churches, particularly the German examples. Up to a point he is right. But the best place to find that renewal is at the fountain head of all Christian church architecture, the basilicas that survive from the Church of the Fathers in the city of Rome: basilicas built primarily for congregational worship, S. Maria Maggiore, S. Prassede, and above all the most beautiful church in Christendom, S. Sabina on the Aventine.

G. W. O. Addleshaw

ANGLICAN HISTORY

Church and People, 1789-1889. By S. C. Carpenter. S.P.C.K. 3 vols. 5s. each.

A reprint of the late Dr S. C. Carpenter's *Church and People, 1789-1889* is much to be welcomed. When the book was first published in 1933, it opened up a new approach to the history of the Church of England in the nineteenth century. Previous books on the subject tended to treat every facet of nineteenth-century Anglicanism exclusively in relation to the Oxford Movement and its aftermath. Dr Carpenter put the Movement in its right perspective. He surveyed in a wonderfully

readable and fresh style the hundred years between the start of the French Revolution and the publication of *Lux Mundi*, and taught us that there were many manifestations of Anglicanism in the period as important as the Oxford Movement and not specifically originating from it. He stressed for instance the importance of the opening years of the nineteenth century and the theology of Alexander Knox and Bishop Jebb for the history of the Church in the Victorian age. He gave prominence to the administrative reforms initiated by Bishop Blomfield and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, the thought of S. T. Coleridge and F. D. Maurice, and the spread of Anglicanism overseas. Some of the best pages are those on Bishop Selwyn and the early days of the Church in New Zealand. The way in which all sides of nineteenth-century Church life receive a fair and balanced treatment gives *Church and People* its peculiar distinction. It is now reprinted in the Seraph books in three volumes, and each volume contains one of the three parts into which the book is divided. They are in stiff paper covers, small, and conveniently handy for the pocket. When the book was first published, it contained an epilogue of sixteen pages, in which Dr Carpenter summarized the main developments in Anglicanism between 1889 and 1933. In the present reprint the epilogue is omitted; but no reason is given and there is nothing to indicate the omission to the reader. Something of the sanity of judgement which pervades the whole book can be gathered from the list of the six people who in Dr Carpenter's opinion were the great formative minds of the nineteenth century: Newman, Bentham, Coleridge, Mill, Darwin, and Maurice. But surely Dr Arnold, one of the most creative and far-seeing of the great Victorians, should figure in such a list.

G. W. O. Addleshaw

CHRISTIAN EXISTENTIALISM

Human Freedom and Social Order: An Essay in Christian Philosophy. By John Wild. Duke University Press; London: Cambridge University Press. 37s. 6d.

Can there be a Christian Philosophy? Many Christians, especially those standing within the Protestant tradition, and of course nearly all non-Christian thinkers, have denied that there can be. Others, as for example Thomists on the one hand and "liberal Christians" on the other, have claimed that there can, and have sought to formulate one. All of these, says Professor Wild, are wrong. He has written this book, first to explain why they are wrong; secondly, to affirm that there can nevertheless be an authentically Christian Philosophy; thirdly, to expound his view that there has never yet been such a thing—though Kierkegaard had the right insights on the subject. Fourthly, he sets out to show how a Christian Ethic would differ in its entire outlook from

"the ethics of self-realization" which have so far affected all treatment of the subject, even by Christian writers, who have almost entirely lost touch with the standpoint of the Gospel ("instead of works to be produced it calls for faith to be enacted"). Finally, he seeks to relate his Christian Existentialism to the conceptions of human order prevalent to-day, and—not very convincingly—to "bridge the gap between the Person and the Group".

Clearly a book with the discussion of such themes as these for its purpose is an ambitious enterprise, not to be assessed "lightly, wantonly and unadvisedly", least of all by a reviewer without qualifications as either a philosopher or a theologian, and within the limits of space available here. The writer of this notice must be content to declare his impression that we are being asked in this book to accept as alone compatible with biblical requirements an altogether too predominantly "subjective" standpoint. On this issue perhaps judgements made upon the thesis presented here will chiefly turn. What is noticeable, however, is how very little attention this Harvard professor pays to the work of contemporary writers who impinge on his field; only Bultmann and Niebuhr get more than a single reference, and the author does not mention Dr J. V. L. Casserley's *The Christian in Philosophy* at all. It is almost as if he desired to treat his subject as a *tabula rasa*, which in view of his opinion that nobody has ever fully understood it in the right way before is perhaps understandable. Nevertheless, however little attention the Professor thinks it appropriate to show to others, it is much to be hoped that those well qualified to do so will pay attention to him. For though his sociological conclusions, when at length we reach them, are sensible rather than profound, the stages by which he brings us to them will surely be found to be challenging, even by those whom he may fail to convince.

MAURICE B. RECKITT

GOSPEL TEACHING

THE GOSPEL OF ST MATTHEW. By M. D. R. WILLINK. R.E.P. 5s. 6d.

THE GOSPEL OF ST LUKE. By E. G. LOOSLEY. R.E.P. 6s.

IN THE evaluation of these two books, one has to bear in mind the restrictions necessarily imposed upon the authors. The Religious Education Press publishes works for teachers in accordance with the requirements of the local educational authority's Agreed Syllabus of religious education. There is a tendency amongst some people to brush aside anything produced in this way as being beyond serious consideration, owing to their belief that an Agreed Syllabus necessarily fails to deal with certain fundamental doctrines of the Catholic Church. This fear is not justified as a careful inspection of the best of the modern Agreed Syllabuses will soon show.

The two small books under review afford a striking example of a width of vision combined with a simple, clear exposition of modern scholarship in dealing with the Gospel narrative.

Another factor which has largely determined the particular form which these books assume is that it has been found to be highly desirable for children in all types of Secondary Schools to have access to suitable literature with the aid of which they can undertake personal research of an elementary nature. These books seek to satisfy such a need and, when technical terms are employed, care is taken to see that they are properly explained.

Both authors have displayed sympathy in admitting critical explanations of the miraculous element in the Gospels but they guide their readers towards an acceptance of the traditional belief of the Church.

Sunday school teachers and leaders of Adult Religious Educational Groups in parishes should also find these books to be helpful.

FRANK A. F. POULDEN

BUDDHIST MISSION TO THE WEST

BUDDHA'S WORDS OF WISDOM. Compiled by G. F. ALLEN. Allen and Unwin 10s. 6d.

MYSTICISM, CHRISTIAN AND BUDDHIST. By D. T. SUZUKI. Allen and Unwin. 13s. 6d.

LIVING ZEN. By ROBERT LINSSEN. Allen and Unwin. 30s.

Buddha's Words of Wisdom, the slightest of these works, is a collection of maxims and utterances attributed to Gotama Buddha and arranged for devotional reading, night and morning, one for each day of the year. To-day's thought (a fair sample) is: "Indifferent to (conventional) virtue and achievement, indifferent to dogma, indifferent to what is called 'good' and 'bad', one remains free—alike of ambition and accomplishment."

Dr Suzuki's *Mysticism, Christian and Buddhist* is published in the "World Perspectives series" which contains also books by Tillich, Maritain, Radhakrishnan, Fred Hoyle, Erich Fromm, and others. It is a more substantial work, a collection of essays particularly concerned with Meister Eckhart, who is taken, somewhat rashly, to be "representative of Christian mysticism", and with Eckhart's relation with Zen and Shin Buddhist mysticism.

Living Zen, a 350-page work, translated from the French, is a systematic exposition, by a Westerner for Westerners, of that Zen Buddhism which is making an increasing impact in certain circles in the West.

These books—and half a dozen others are advertized from the same publisher—are all addressed to post-Christians, to would-be religious people for whom Christianity seems to be an arid, worldly, irrational, and unspiritual dogmatic system They provoke some reflections.

The first is this: we have signally failed, we are signally failing, to "get across" the central Christian affirmations. Dr Suzuki has an interesting appendix to one chapter on "Crucifixion and Enlightenment", in which he treats of the crucifix as a symbol. But he thinks of it solely as a symbol of our need to deal with our disorderly egos, and would much prefer a less distasteful symbol. He contrasts at some length Christ hanging "helpless, full of sadness on the vertically erected cross", with the Buddha lying horizontally on a bed, serene in death. There is no recognition of the other forms of cross-symbol—the empty cross, or the Byzantine Christ reigning in glory from the tree. Above all, there is no recognition that we did not, because of some psychological disorder common to Christians, *choose* this range of symbols, but had them imposed on us by what actually happened. Similarly, Mr Linssen in a chapter comparing Buddhism and Christianity does not mention the Incarnation: I am reminded of the Burmese girl in Nevil Shute's *Chequer Board* who "didn't understand that bit" in the missionaries' teaching.

Have we failed to communicate our understanding of the central event because it is a "scandal", offensive to human reason, and not to be known "after the flesh"? Or because too often at the centre of our own being the dogma is not alive but lifeless? I am reminded of my small son coming back from school and confirming a Scripture lesson: "Daddy, Jews are people who don't believe that Jesus is the Son of God, aren't they?", and of all those polls which show that a surprisingly high proportion of the British people *do* believe that he was the Son of God; but what do these formal statements convey of meaning, of wonder, of adoration?

We preach Jesus Christ, the power of God and the wisdom of God, "born of a woman, born under the law" and crucified *sub Pontio Pilato*, and at the same time the eternal Word, the Beginning and the End, in whom and by whom all things are; and he is known in that mystery which can be described both as new being in Christ and as the fellowship of the Holy Spirit. We have here without doubt a massive task of understanding and restatement; there is the well-worn problem of the "scandal of particularity", and the newer issues created by our modern preoccupation with history. But the widespread and distressing failure to grasp what Christianity is all about suggests that there may be a prior task before all this: to expose ourselves corporately to the amazing wonder of the God-Man, that our dogma may become joyful.

This comes before the re-interpretation of Christian theology and the problem of communication and so on, but these pose their own problems too. This Buddhist writing seems to me largely uncomprehending of Christianity and much of it is to me at all events virtually unintelligible into the bargain. What however, also worries me is the uneasy suspicion that most Christian writing is just as incomprehensible to Buddhists—and not only to Buddhists, but also to the massive crowds of wistful post-Christians in our own country.

DAVID M. PATON

HINDUISM

THE BRAHMA SUTRA. THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE. Translated with an introduction and notes by S. RADHAKRISHNAN. Allen and Unwin. 42s.

THE *Brahma Sūtra*, forms the third in the threefold canon of Scripture on which the religious tradition of Hinduism is based: together with the *Upanishads* and the *Bhagavadgita* it constitutes the *Vedanta*, so called because it enshrines the final aim and essence of the *Veda*. Tradition ascribes the authorship of its 555 aphorisms to the sage *Bādarāyana* and, since they take into account almost all other Indian systems, their date cannot be earlier than the second century B.C. These Sanskrit aphorisms are characterized by an extreme conciseness of style and are consequently highly enigmatic. Dr Radhakrishnan in his second chapter reviews the distinctive doctrines of the twelve still surviving commentaries ranging from the ninth to the eighteenth centuries. Very diverse interpretations of the sutras are given by the different writers. Some read into them the raptures of a personal experience of God, while others expound them in terms of an abstract idealism. For the great names of Śanikava and Ramanuja represent two concurrent traditions in Indian thought and, though they differed on so vital a point as the independent reality of the human soul, Dr Radhakrishnan denies that the apprehension of God as personal was a concession to the human mind and appeals to Śanikava himself in support of his conviction that the two traditions are complementary and not exclusive.

But Dr Radhakrishnan does not offer this massive study of an ancient Indian classic solely in the interests of pure scholarship. Its cosmology is obsolete, but the depth and emancipation the sutras evince in grappling with the ultimate questions of religion and philosophy give them, he maintains, a contemporary value. He develops his reinterpretation of them systematically in the remaining five chapters of his Introduction with an erudition equally at home in Asia and in Europe. It is interrupted here and there to answer complaints against positions maintained in it: e.g., the objection that Hinduism sanctions a world-transcending rather than a world-transforming ethic (pp. 156 ff) and the doctrine of rebirth (pp. 198 ff). In his concluding pages when dealing with world-redemption he asks the question, "Is all this difficult process of soul-making to end in their breaking-up again?" His answer to his own question, "Personality, love and service should not be allowed to disappear in some infinite sea of undifferentiated being", is, perhaps, not the least unexpected thing to find in his book.

✠ NOEL HALL

SCIENCE AND RELIGION

THE SPIRITUAL CRISIS OF THE SCIENTIFIC AGE. By G. D. YARNOLD. Allen and Unwin. 18s.

RELIGION AND THE SCIENTIFIC OUTLOOK. By T. R. MILES. Allen and Unwin. 21s.

HERE are two books about the relationship between science and religion. They could scarcely be more different. Dr Yarnold discusses, in what he calls "in effect . . . three essays", the crisis through which we are passing: first, the crisis of understanding the universe by the ways of scientific explanation ("from below") and of religious interpretation ("from above"); second, the crisis of belief—the re-examination and perhaps restatement of Christian faith in the light of scientific thought; and third, the crisis of living, the ethical questions raised by our technical achievement. Mr Miles writes as a philosopher concerned to examine the challenge to Christian belief presented by modern philosophical thinking since the rise of logical positivism. Both writers are Christians, and both books are worth reading; but the first is more likely to enlighten the Christian who wants to understand the scientist than vice versa, while the second may well be of real value to both sides.

Dr Yarnold's book suffers both from its style, which is heavily overloaded with nouns, and from his failure to maintain the level of his insight throughout. He gives an excellent account of scientific method and of the nature of scientific "laws". "The physical sciences build up a hypothetical world, a world of mental concepts and mathematical formulae" (elsewhere described as "relating numerical observations which are derived from pointer readings") "which stands in a certain relationship to the actual external world; but which in no sense *is* the actual external world." When he comes to theology, however, he fails to make it clear that this—in an exactly comparable way—builds up a hypothetical world of mental concepts expressed in words. "God", for instance, is a word, and to discuss the nature of God without adequate consideration of the nature of language is to be in danger of rendering argument meaningless.

Now this question of the meaning not only of words but also of statements is precisely the concern of logical positivism: which is why Mr Miles's book comes as a relief. Here the basic question of meaning is squarely faced. He rejects the extremes of logical positivism, but argues very sensibly that some of our more simple-minded ways of talking about God must be abandoned. This is a lively book with a sense of humour, and if it does not quite reach the level of insight of a Paul Tillich, at least many people will find it much easier to read and therefore more immediately enlightening.

CHARLES DAVEY

PILGRIM'S PROGRESS

JOHN BUNYAN: THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS FROM THIS WORLD TO THAT WHICH IS TO COME. Edited by JAMES BLANTON WHAREY. Revised by ROGER SHARROCK. Oxford University Press. 63s.

The Pilgrim's Progress (First Part) was licensed on 18 February 1678, and thereafter editions appeared in rapid succession, the eleventh being reached before Bunyan's death on 31 August 1688. The second edition, with additions, was published in 1678. The third edition (1679), with some further additions, was virtually the first complete edition of the work, for it contains the last additions of any consequence that Bunyan made to the text. (The Second Part appeared in 1684, and went through two editions in the author's life-time.)

The book (both Parts) was first included in the series of Oxford English Texts in 1928, when the editor, Professor J. B. Wharey, declared in his preface that the aim of this edition was "to write the history of the editions of the *Pilgrim's Progress* that was issued in England from 1678 to 1688 and to discover as far as may be possible their relative textual value". The primary object of Dr Roger Sharrock's revision is "to complete the task by establishing a sound text".

Professor Wharey relied almost exclusively on the third edition (1679) as the latest to include substantial additions by Bunyan. Dr Sharrock's revised edition is the first in which the text is based on the first edition of 1678, or, for passages introduced later, the earliest edition in which the new matter occurs: and it retains as undoubtedly superior the spellings, loose grammar, and provincial forms of speech which was normalized in the later editions. Furthermore, Professor Wharey's bibliographical introduction has been carefully revised and augmented by the addition of two new sections, of which the latter (pp. cvii–cxi) summarizes Dr Sharrock's reasons for basing his text upon the first edition of 1678, while the former (pp. xxi–xxxv), which is of more general interest, discusses the composition of *The Pilgrim's Progress* (the First Part) in relation to Bunyan's two imprisonments, and establishes the conclusion that the greater part of it was written during his first imprisonment (November 1660–March 1672) and soon after the completion of *Grace Abounding*. (Dr Sharrock gently demolishes "the pleasing legend" that Bunyan wrote it in the little town jail in the gate-house on Bedford Bridge: since his offence came under county jurisdiction, he must have served his sentence in the county jail, and not in what was merely the town lock-up.)

A Commentary of very reasonable dimensions (pp. 312-52), explaining some of Bunyan's references and phrases, has been added for the convenience of readers unfamiliar with Puritan terminology (e.g., "a fair and flourishing Professor", or "Ordinances" for "Sacraments") and with theological controversies and biblical allusions. Dr Sharrock suggests that in the figure of *Evangelist* Bunyan "evokes the character of the ideal pastor, perhaps with particular reference to John Gifford,

first minister of the Bedford Independent church, who received him into its fellowship" (p. 316); while *Mr Worldly-Wiseman* may be based upon the Rev. Edward Fowler, Vicar of Northill near Bedford, who, having conformed to the Prayer Book, did not suffer in the Ejection of 1662: this, coupled with his latitudinarian leanings in divinity, had excited Bunyan's hostility (p. 314).

Dr Sharrock has given us a text of which the influence is bound to be far-reaching. There is little reason to regret the omission of Professor Wharey's bibliography. The volume, with its numerous illustrations, is admirably printed and produced. It is clear indeed, both from its price and from its character, that this is an edition for the library rather than for the general reader. But Dr Sharrock never confuses scholarship with pendantry, and his genuine feel for Bunyan's work is sufficiently illustrated by his note (p. 352) on the conclusion of the Second Part: "The summons to each pilgrim follows an impressively regular formula, so that the whole final episode has a marked rhythm, an almost musical pattern of recurrence and variation. There is the letter from the Celestial City, the emblematic token of its authenticity, the bequest of each one before crossing the river, and their last words. The use throughout of the imagery of death from Ecclesiastes xii was habitual at Puritan death-beds. . . ."

CHARLES SMYTH

THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST

WHAT CHURCHES OF CHRIST STAND FOR. By WILLIAM ROBINSON. Berean Press. 3s. 6d.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER. By WILLIAM ROBINSON. Berean Press. 2s. 6d.

INTRODUCTION TO CALAMY REVISED. By A. G. MATTHEWS. Independent Press. 5s.

THE Churches of Christ or Disciples of Christ are one of the most attractive forms of American Protestantism. Founded in reaction against the prevailing fissiparous tendency which was proving so disastrous, they have done their best to avoid becoming just another denomination; and though at first their appeal was simply to individuals to leave denominations which owed their existence to private opinions rather than to the New Testament, they now take the lead in furthering the ecumenical movement among the different Christian bodies. Dr Robinson's explanation of their position is clear; he quotes the maxim, "Where the Scriptures speak, we speak: where they are silent, we are silent". They have a high doctrine of church and sacraments, but they oppose infant baptism. It is not clear how successful they are in combatting Christological heresies.

At their Sunday worship the sermon may for a good reason be omitted, but never Holy Communion. This scriptural emphasis makes them sympathetic to the Liturgical Movement, and Dr Robinson quotes from Dix's *Shape of the Liturgy* with approval. The celebrant composes his own liturgy for the Sunday; there are usually three lessons one after another, with no psalms or hymns between. Plainly things will be satisfactory when Dr Robinson himself is the celebrant, but the disadvantages of extempore worship are obvious from his cautions against slovenliness, on the need to train celebrants in their art, against interpolating "nice" additions and praising either the dead or visiting preachers.

Dr Matthews has reprinted as a separate booklet the Introduction he wrote to *Calamy Revised*, which was published by the Oxford University Press. He discusses Calamy's reliability in connection with Walker's attack upon it.

KENNETH N. ROSS

WOMEN IN THE SCRIPTURES

ALL THE WOMEN OF THE BIBLE. By EDITH DEEN. Independent Press. 15s.

THIS BOOK is the work of an American lady with long experience in journalism. She sets out to provide "a comprehensive encyclopedia or dictionary including *all of the women of the Bible*". For this purpose, the Bible does not include the Apocrypha. The book consists of three sections. The first and longest section contains "Searching Studies of Women in the Foreground", starting with Eve and ending with Eunice and Lois. The second is an "Alphabetical Listing of Named Women", with short biographical notes. The women treated in the first section are mentioned in this list, and there are notes on all the others. The third section comprises "Chronological Listings of Nameless Women in the Background"; these are classified as daughters, wives, mothers, widows, and others. There is a bibliography, and also an index.

In her studies of the various characters, the author is careful to distinguish between the recorded facts and the imaginative conjectures to which they lead. Full references are given throughout, and the narratives are clear and accurate. But there is some confusion on page 329, in the account of Absalom's conspiracy. Ahithophel had been David's counsellor, but he had joined Absalom, probably by invitation. There is no evidence that he tried to trick Absalom, and in fact it was he who offered to go and assassinate David. This book can be cordially recommended to all teachers of Scripture, and especially to those concerned with girls and young women.

G. J. INGLIS

A MARIAN MARTYR

THE LIFE OF ROWLAND TAYLOR. By WILLIAM JAMES BROWN. Epworth Press. 21s.

THE PARISH of Hadleigh in Suffolk has its niche in modern Church history as its Rectory provided the setting for the conference in July 1833, which marked one of the beginnings of the Oxford Movement. But it had an earlier claim to fame. The preacher at the end of the 1833 conference declared, "I stand where the Martyr, Rowland Taylor, stood. May God in his mercy give grace to the clergy of this day to follow his example, and if need be, to testify for the truth, even unto death".

Taylor was a Cambridge man, Rector of Hadleigh, who was burned on Aldham Common on 9 February 1554/5. Strype described him in his *Memorials of Cranmer* as "an extraordinary man, both for his learning as well as his bold and brave profession of Christ's religion, even to the fiery trial. He had read [which was rare in those days] all St. Augustine's works, St. Cyprian, Gregory Nazianzen, Eusebius, Origen and divers other fathers. He professed the law and had read over the canon law also as he told the Lord Chancellor Gardiner when in his scorn and rage he called him *an ignorant beetle brow . . .*"

The present Rector has gathered together all that is known of his brave and learned predecessor; and his account is well illustrated. He leans rather heavily upon Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, but that was probably inevitable. The book makes a useful small addition to English Reformation history.

H. G. G. HERKLOTS

WYVERN BOOKS

KNIGHT OF THE BURNING HEART. By LESLIE F. CHURCH. Epworth Press. 2s. 6d.

GIVE GOD A CHANCE. By W. E. SANGSTER. Epworth Press. 2s. 6d.

THE MANHOOD OF THE MASTER. By H. EMERSON FOSDICK. Epworth Press. 3s. 6d.

A CHRISTIAN COMMENTARY ON COMMUNISM. By EDWARD ROGERS. Epworth Press. 3s. 6d.

THE SHORT biography of John Wesley by a well-known Methodist preacher is dedicated by its author "To Youth, in Whose Quest and Conquest I Believe". There is, therefore, quite rightly emphasis on the story as such; and this is told efficiently and picturesquely, with a clear eye for character. Dr Church does well to point out how much the Christian social effort of the nineteenth century owes to Wesley. Perhaps Wesley was more indebted to mystical writers like Law and à Kempis than appears on the surface. We could not expect discussion of this kind of topic in a book of this nature. But some further explanation of Wesley's grave step in ordaining to the ministry is necessary; for it does

not consort at all with his own firm belief in the Church and "the authority of Jesus Christ conveyed to me by the Archbishop of Canterbury when he laid hands on me", as he said to Beau Nash. Private readers will thoroughly enjoy this little book, and it would also be very useful to the discussion group.

Dr Sangster is another famous Methodist preacher, who has helped the clergy of all denominations with his excellent books on preaching. Here, with a special eye on working men, he addresses himself both to those on the edge of belief and to those who would like to help inquiring souls. The book is described as containing "one hundred basic religious questions plainly answered". The questions are divided into groups under main headings, such as Jesus Christ, the Bible, Prayer, Providence, the Church. In his foreword the author shows us that he is aware that full answers cannot be given except in the context of practising membership of the Church. Nevertheless, all kinds of people (not least the clergy) will find wit and wisdom and the impulse to think further in this useful little book.

All who knew *The Manhood of the Master* over forty years ago will welcome its reappearance. It is a little devotional classic which has helped thousands of people to think of Christ and to imitate him. Now a man of eighty, the author has the satisfaction of writing an introduction to this new, popular edition. The book gives daily readings from the Gospels for twelve weeks. Each reading is followed by a short, arresting meditation, and each week deals with one great aspect of the character of Christ—his joy, his fearlessness, his magnanimity, and so on. At the end of each week there is a more extended essay, "Comment for the Week", followed by a blank page headed "Topics for thought and discussion". The root conviction behind the author's deep and reverent appraisal of Christ is that "he is not a dated historic teacher, but a pioneer, still far ahead of us". Dr Fosdick's book seems as relevant and reads as freshly as it did when first it appeared.

The author of this important book, *A Christian Commentary on Communism*, is general secretary of the Christian Citizenship Department of the Methodist Church. He is a trained economist as well as a theologian, and these qualifications, combined with a clear pungent style, enable him to present to us a penetrating Christian commentary on the manifold forms of Communism, from Plato to Stalin. In comment the author is always fair, and does not hesitate to point out the shortcomings of Christian people in their neglect of the poor, the underpaid, and the overworked.

Mr Rogers thinks Communism is inherently self-contradictory; and that on the way to realizing itself it has to become something quite different—so that Soviet Communism is neither Soviet nor Communist. It would be a happy thing if all Communists would consent to read this book. It should certainly be read by all Christians. Ministers of religion will find in it abundant material for sermons or group discussion.

GEORGE M. BOSWORTH

LITURGIES: ANCIENT AND MODERN

THE EARLY LITURGY. By JOSEF A. JUNGMANN, S.J. Darton, Longman & Todd. 50s.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN LITURGY. By PETER HINCHLIFF. Oxford University Press. 21s.

SINCE the publication of *The Shape of the Liturgy* the interest of English-speaking Christendom is gradually catching up with the considerable preliminary achievement which underlies the modern "liturgical movement" of continental Roman Catholicism. It is particularly valuable, therefore, to have a translation of another of the books of one of the most distinguished Jesuit liturgists. *The Early Liturgy* is a survey of the practice and theory of worship in the Church up to the time of Gregory the Great. There are five sections which trace the developments which took place in the five and a half centuries under review. The account is far-ranging as the following chapter-headings indicate: "Eucharistic Liturgy of the 3rd Century", "Baptism and Preparation for Baptism", "Pagan and Christian Mysteries", "Veneration of Martyrs", "The Easter Cycle". The work is at once scholarly and readable—a combination of virtues unusual in the field of liturgical studies where, all too often, the letter killeth. Many of the issues which Dr Jungmann discusses are, of course, controversial: naturally he writes from a Roman Catholic point of view, but, to me, he seems to be so completely fair-minded that Christians not in communion with the see of Rome may easily make the necessary mental adjustments while reading. His approach takes full account not only of new knowledge of the early centuries, but also of the critical approach to the Scriptures. For example, concerning the words of institution, he writes:

> As all of us know, the accounts presented by the three evangelists, Matthew, Mark and Luke, and by St Paul differ widely in many particulars. Not even the words which our Lord pronounced over the bread and wine are reproduced in the same form. And, besides, the oldest extant texts of the Mass present the account in still different forms. What can be the reason for this diversity? It seems that this diversity can best be explained by supposing that the varying Biblical texts represent, not so many hazy recollections of what our Lord said at the Last Supper, but the actual liturgical usages of the primitive Christian communities, each shaping and developing its own redaction of the tradition (p. 37).

It is refreshing to read sentences like this, and I fancy that such commonsense outspokenness may come as a surprise to many English Roman Catholics. It is quite clear to those who study the works of Dr Jungmann and other continental Roman Catholics, and who visit the new churches being built in France, Switzerland, and Germany, that something like a "reformation" is taking place: this "bloodless" revolution, though still sporadic, is gathering strength and will quite

soon lead to the regular celebration of the Mass in the vernacular, and may eventually give rise to a radical declericalization of the liturgy. This is the logic of Dr Jungmann's exposition of the *spirit* of early Christianity as manifest in its formal worship.

The second book is an extended account of the actual revision of the Anglican rite in South Africa, with particular emphasis on the "Consecration Prayer". (Incidentally, part of the basis of the revision has been attributed to theories advanced by W. C. Bishop in a series of articles in *Church Quarterly Review* in the first decade of this century.) No doubt this book will interest those who have known the personalities engaged, and those whose interest is in the technicalities of liturgical controversy, but for the general reader it is all rather tedious. There is a long account of arguments concerning the wording of an epiclesis: members of the present English Liturgical Commision will save themselves a great deal of theological trouble if they avoid going over all this ground again. This book would be much more intelligible if it included the full text of the "final form" of 1929—without this it is more than a little disturbing to come across references to such things as the "second fraction".

The last thirty years have seen the development of new attitudes within liturgical studies: the antiquarian approach has been replaced by a concern for the living Church at worship. It is desirable that we should find out all we can about the forms of worship in the early Church, not in order that we may merely reproduce those forms today, but, rather, in order that we may try to recapture something of the *spirit* of those early Christian fellowships. This done, we may select and transpose the early forms into patterns appropriate for our own day. Dr Jungmann's book is a good example of the necessary approach and Mr Hinchliff's account is a salutary warning of what may happen if the purpose of twentieth-century revision is not properly grasped.

GILBERT COPE

CHRISTIAN INITIATION

DOCUMENTS OF THE BAPTISMAL LITURGY. By E. C. WHITAKER. S.P.C.K. 30s.

AS IT is written in the blurb of the publisher, Mr Whitaker "has performed a most useful service". This is indeed true, and one wishes that much more could be said in praise of this collection of some forty passages, which illustrate the beliefs and rituals concerned with Baptism which were current in the Church from the second century to the twelfth. The collection is comprehensive: it contains the available material from both Western and Eastern parts of the Church, and includes the full text of the known baptismal rites of the period. The collection is divided into twelve clear sections, and each particular translation is prefaced by straightforward and objective notes stating what is known about the document in question. A glossary is provided.

What then is lacking? First, an index. To have provided this would have been a formidable task, and those readers who take the trouble to do their own indexing will certainly profit much.

Secondly, there is lacking an interpretation of the course of events which these documents reflect, and an appraisal of their significance and relevance in the baptismal controversies of to-day. Mr Whitaker has so scrupulously refrained from allowing his own thoughts to obtrude that it seems almost impolite to draw attention to the disadvantages of this unusual modesty. He is obviously very familiar with the Church's understanding of Initiation in the first millennium of its existence, and it is to be hoped that he will publish his views on the relative importance of the earlier beliefs and practices to our present dilemma. I should like, for instance, to know how he would deal with the fact that (as is evident from all the ceremonies of renunciation) belief in Satan was just as real as belief in the Trinity.

Meanwhile, Mr Whitaker leaves us to draw our own conclusions, and we must be grateful to him for making the essential documents available in a form, and at a price, which are both reasonable.

GILBERT COPE

THE PURITAN INCIDENT

THE PURITANS AND THE CHURCH COURTS IN THE DIOCESE OF YORK: 1560-1642. By RONALD A. MARCHANT. Longmans. 63s.

THIS valuable book is one of the many happy results which spring from Canon J. S. Purvis's great work in assembling and making better available the York diocesan and provincial records at the Borthwick Institute. Dr Marchant has made good use of these, as well as of the Nottingham Archdeaconry records in Nottingham University Library, in order to produce a fascinating study of ecclesiastical discipline in the period between the Elizabethan Settlement and the Civil War. He presents a picture which does much to control and correct the easy generalizations which have served us hitherto. Although confined to one diocese, his portrait is not narrow in scope, for, besides being the metropolitical see of the North, York was at the time still a vast diocese of something like 10,000 square miles. Moreover, as Professor Dickens has recently reminded us, it was by no means the backward and wild district often imagined, including as it did both rich agricultural areas and ports and towns of growing industrial importance. All this explains the prevalence of Puritanism there (for it was from men economically active that Puritans were largely recruited) and justifies our regarding the diocese as not unrepresentative of the country as a whole: indeed its population of over 300,000 constituted about a tenth of the nation.

Forensic material can never of course give an exact and balanced picture of the life of any community. Nevertheless, when the prominence of ecclesiastical courts in the Middle Ages and later is

remembered, it will be seen that it comes nearer so doing in the period here covered, especially when the author supplements it from other sources. It most certainly throws a light upon administrative policy. What clearly emerges from these researches is the slow change under successive archbishops from a blind eye toleration of moderate non-conformity to Archbishop Neile's attempt to enforce Laudian standards. Nevertheless it is equally apparent that archbishops were to a great extent dependent upon their archdeacons and officials in implementing any policy, and that circumstances always militated against any doctrinaire imposition of the legal standards of worship and ceremonial. Indeed, had all conscientious Puritans been harried into schism, the Church would have collapsed, since too many conformists were men without activity or zeal. This partly explains the surprisingly lenient way in which even Separatists, of the type from which the Pilgrim Fathers were drawn, were treated; Archbishop Toby Matthew, himself of Puritan sympathies, applied only so much pressure as was requisite to prevent their organizing a large-scale schism, without at the same time attracting to them the sympathy of the moderate Puritans by violent persecution. The type of Puritan who conformed so far as his conscience allowed was in fact the key to the situation. Here it was that Neile contributed to the disaster of the Civil War by shutting out all Puritans from higher preferment in the diocese, unlike his predecessors, who had never treated them as pariahs. As Dr Marchant says of Puritans favoured by earlier archbishops:

> But most of all their presence in the official life of the Church showed the Puritan wing that it was an accepted part of the Church, so long as it was loyal to her order and government, even though it desired further reformation of that order and government. The activities of the Puritans were consequently diverted into constructive tasks in parish work. Neile's actions must have gone a long way to turn the Puritan mentality into one of a persecuted minority, a "we" against a "they", which is fatal to the well-being of any society (p. 204).

That is a fact which ecclesiastical authority in all ages is slow to learn and reluctant to admit, just as is the case with political authority. It is a dangerous thing for any man, with or without the grace of Orders, to possess the means of coercion, for "the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God".

Both to the historian and to the more general reader this scholarly work is of value, and only a review of inordinate length could do real justice to it. Its general narrative is accompanied by accounts of illustrative cases from the court records, always vivid and sometimes amusing, and it concludes with a long and well-documented biographical dictionary of the Puritan clergy of the diocese who can be identified from the records. Dr Marchant is to be congratulated upon a distinguished contribution to English church history.

THOMAS M. PARKER

ARCHIEPISCOPAL SAINT

ST EDMUND OF ABINGDON. By C. H. LAWRENCE. Clarendon Press. 60s.

ST EDMUND RICH, as he used to be known from the name of his father, was Archbishop of Canterbury from 1233 to 1240, a significant figure in English history, a representative churchman of what is sometimes regarded as a golden age. Shortly after his death he was canonized by Innocent IV.

The lives of thirteenth-century saints follow almost prescribed patterns, partly because conventional conduct was easily made to fulfil requisite conditions, partly because the age demanded holy men. There must be evidence of miracles following upon consistently virtuous conduct. A biography, then, was bound to be also hagiography, and it is in this light that Mr Lawrence has issued his new and careful study of St Edmund of Abingdon. Since no less a chronicler than Matthew Paris compiled a biography, presenting interesting problems of derivation, the manuscript evidence has deserved the fresh investigation that it has received.

What emerges clearly from analysis and comparison is that the Archbishop was an influential and determined figure, who had much support in his differences with King and Papal legate. Of his asceticism and holy life there is the fullest evidence: what Mr Lawrence has done has been to determine the manuscript tradition of this, to compare the published versions, chiefly in the invaluable *Thesaurus novus Anecdotorum*, with the manuscript *Quadriloquus*, the Life by Eustace of Faversham, the life by Matthew Paris, and the letters of Postulation from the Treasury of the Cathedral of Sens. It is all carefully and diligently compiled, there is a valuable comparative synopsis of the contents of the six variants of the life, an account of the Archbishop's *familia* and an itinerary. It is, perhaps, unfortunate that full account could not be taken of Dr R. Vaughan's *Matthew Paris* but, while some minor matters of chronology are left a little uncertain, we now have, as never before, the essential materials for, and some intelligent comment on, the life of an archbishop and a saint who was contemporary and not unworthy colleague of the great Grosseteste.

G. R. POTTER.

EARLY GERMAN CHRISTIANITY

ADAM OF BREMEN: HISTORY OF THE ARCHBISHOPS OF HAMBURG-BREMEN. Translated by F. J. TSCHAN. Columbia University Press. London: Oxford University Press. 48s.

THERE is much that remains obscure about the history of Northern Europe during the tenth and eleventh centuries. Adam of Bremen, writing between 1076 and 1081, set out to provide a kind of official biography of his patron and admired chief, Adalbert, Archbishop of

Hamburg from 1042 to 1072. This involved an account of the introduction of Christianity into the Hamburg-Bremen district under Charlemagne and the vicissitudes of missionary enterprise thereafter. Adam was diligent, honest, and intelligent; like all his generation he copied uncritically and cares more for the virtues of his hero than for imperial policy or social development. When he can borrow a phrase or a passage from Horace, Sallust, Juvenal, or Virgil he does so without acknowledgement; while the Vulgate was so familiar to him, and its phrases occurred so naturally, that to provide references for the occasional biblical phrase can be misleading. He makes much use of Gregory of Tours, Einhart, and such Lives and Annals as were accessible to him, sometimes introducing illuminating variations.

All this has long been available in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, but is now translated in entirety into English. The late Mr F. J. Tschan took great pains over his self-imposed task: he prefers to be literal rather than elegant: *"caesar" remains "caesar"* when applied to the Emperor Henry III, *"pastor evangelice"* becomes "evangelical pastor" and *"laboris nostri monimento"*, "muniment of my endeavor". It is assumed that the reader knows what is meant by *xenodochium*, cervical, *proto scrinarius*, cockle, archimandrite, *quaestor*, and the senatorial order, and there are many renderings which will displease the expert.

For those unable to read Latin easily or for whom the text is inaccessible this version is more than adequate, and the notes, sometimes a little obvious or derivative, are helpful, while the identifications of places are extremely convenient. The bibliography at the end is long and uncritical, but reasonably exhaustive.

G. R. Potter

MEDIEVAL JURISDICTION

York Metropolitan Jurisdiction and Papal Judges Delegate (1279-1296). By Robert Brentano. University of California Publications in History, vol. lvii (1959). $6.00

This is a useful constitutional study of the archiepiscopates of William Wickwane and John Romeyne, illustrating the late thirteenth century attempt to exercise metropolitan rights over suffragans in a new manner: "a peculiar combination of the ancient concept of ecclesiastical hierarchy with the thirteenth century burst of reform". The reform movement stemmed from the Lateran council of 1215, and the legatine council of London in 1237. Archbishops Pecham at Canterbury and Wickwane at York sought to bring about reform in like manner, and chiefly by the visitation of the sees of their suffragans: Pecham with more success. Visitations by bishops had been very early enjoined: visitation by metropolitans was unusual. The see of Durham had never been visited by the metropolitan of

York before Wickwane undertook it: the Church had been free and immune from such visitation from the time of its foundation. To put the metropolitan in actual administrative charge of Church discipline in the suffragan sees (for visitation was thorough and meant to be followed by archiepiscopal action in the provincial council) was novel, and part of the contemporary movement to centralize Church administration under the papacy.

To many cathedral chapters, local archdeacons, and chapters of collegiate churches, the new claim of metropolitan rights seemed a matter of feudal usurpation. These new claims were made on the grounds of papal privilege: the metropolitan had received the pallium, in virtue of which he was entitled to have his cross borne before him erect through the sees of his suffragans. To have his cross borne erect through another province as a papal representative was another matter, for the archbishop of the province traversed also wore the pallium; Pecham attacked both Wickwane and Romeyn as they returned through his province from their consecrations in Italy. Pecham's official stopped Wickwane at Rochester and broke his cross.

The claim to visit the chapters and sees of suffragans was complicated by the right of the suffragan or his subjects to appeal to the pope, which was done in the bitterly opposed effort of Wickwane to visit the Church of Durham. In one attempted visitation, Wickwane's life was threatened; in another, he was met at the gates of the city by a crowd of the bishop's knights and other laymen, who prevented his entry. The Bishop of Durham had already appealed to the pope against the visitation; Wickwane now excommunicated the rebels and laid Durham under an interdict. In the excommunication, Wickwane specifically cited the Bishop of Durham, and the prior, and other officers of Durham cathedral. Wickwane's two attempts to visit involved in fact an ecclesiastical civil war between York and Durham, and the spending of much money in bribes by both sides at the Roman curia. The pope appointed judges delegate to try the case and eventually, in 1286, a compromise was arrived at by the efforts of the king.

The book is to be commended for its detailed statement of the new form of metropolitan rights claimed, and the opposition to them in the north of England.

M. Deanesly